UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

ENVIRONMENTAL ETHICS: AN INTERPRETIVE ANALYSIS OF OUTDOOR LEADERS'/SCHOLARS' DISCOURSE

by

Sean Edward Ryan

©

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts.

Department of Physical Education and Recreation

Edmonton, Alberta

Fall 1999

National Library of Canada
Acquisitions and Bibliographic Services
395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Bibliothèque nationale du Canada
Acquisitions et services bibliographiques
395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Your file Votre référence

Our file Notre référence

The author has granted a non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of this thesis in microform, paper or electronic formats.

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de cette thèse sous la forme de microfiche/film, de reproduction sur papier ou sur format électronique.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

0-612-46993-X

Canada

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

LIBRARY RELEASE FORM

NAME OF AUTHOR: SEAN EDWARD RYAN

TITLE OF THESIS: ENVIRONMENTAL ETHICS: AN INTERPRETIVE ANALYSIS OF OUTDOOR LEADERS'/SCHOLARS' DISCOURSE

DEGREE: MASTER OF ARTS

YEAR THIS DEGREE GRANTED: 1999

Permission is hereby granted to the University of Alberta Library to reproduce single copies of this thesis and to lend or sell such copies for private, scholarly, or scientific research purposes only.

The author reserves all other publication rights in association with the copyright in the thesis, and except as hereinbefore provided, neither the thesis nor any substantial portion thereof may be printed or otherwise reproduced in any material form whatever without the author's prior written permission.

Sean Ryan

11412 71st Avenue
Edmonton, Alberta
Canada
T6G 0A7

Date: June 25/99

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research for acceptance, a thesis entitled **Environmental Ethics: An interpretive analysis of outdoor leaders'/scholars' discourse** submitted by **Sean Edward Ryan** in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of **Master of Arts**

(Supervisor, Dr. Karen Fox)

(Dr. Debra Shogan)

(Dr. Gordon Walker)

(Dr. Dave Whitson)

Date: 22 June 1999

ABSTRACT

This thesis is a postmodern critical interpretation of the environmental ethical discourse of two outdoor leaders/scholars (Bob Henderson and Leo McAvoy) to understand some of the discursive effects of power. It positions both deep ecology and the land ethic (identified as central by each participant) as having positive and negative consequences in connection with 1) how the human subject and nature/wilderness is positioned, constructed, and legitimated, 2) what is seen as the "correct" relationship between humans and the earth/environment, and 3) what is promoted as the "proper" behaviour while in the outdoors. Both participants' discourses were explored for the sites of resistence each occupied toward more dominant discourses of environmental ethics and traditional education. The cyborg image was also employed as a means of illustrating some of the discursive positioning each environmental ethic enacted, as well as suggesting some alternatives ways outdoor professionals can engage the ecological problematic.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express sincere appreciation for the participants in this study. Both Bob Henderson and Leo McAvoy showed themselves to be caring and dedicated leaders and teachers for their students, provided me with insights into their lives and beliefs, and assisted and supported in the production of an accurate and detailed descriptive section of the thesis. Both are engaging and compassionate leaders and scholars, and it was an honour to have them as participants in this thesis.

I would also extend a thank-you to all of the members of my committee for the support and encouragement I felt throughout the process. In particular, Dr. Karen Fox, for support and dedication that went well beyond expectations and requirements. Dr. Julia Ellis also deserves mention and thanks for her work and encouragement on early drafts of the methodology section.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER PAGE

I INTRODUCTION....1

II LITERATURE REVIEW....19

Introduction....19

The Literature from Outdoor Education/Recreation....20

Outdoor Education....20

Outdoor Recreation....28

Environmental Ethics from Philosophy....39

Rights-Based Views....39

Meta-Individual Rights Views....41

The Basis for Valuation in Meta-Individual Rights-Based Views....44

Christian Environmental Ethics....45

Deep Ecology....47

A Critical Postmodern Perspective....49

The Cyborg Image....51

Ordered Evil and Trespasses....56

Deep Ecology and the Will to Totality....58

Summary....62

III METHODOLOGY....65

Interpretive Research....65

Critical Interpretation....66

Method....74
Conclusion....78
IV DESCRIPTION OF ETHICAL DISCOURSE....81
Introduction....81
Bob's Discourse....81
Surfacing....81
Storying the Land....84
Ceremony....85
Language....87
The Second Tier....89
Body and Mechanical Time....93
The Warm and the Cold....94
Leo's Discourse....97
A Rich History....97
The Land Ethic....102
The Biotic Community....104
Minimum Impact....108
V ANALYSIS....118
Introduction....118
Bob's Discourse....119
The Puppet and the Puppeteer: Ecological Ventriloquism....119
Of Humans and Nature....128
Discourse as Resistence–Experiential Education....135

Leo's Discourse.....144

The Land Ethic and Ecology.....145

The Demand of Minimum Impact.....148

The Panoptic Gaze.....151

Of Humans and Nature.....153

Know Thyself: The Discourse of the Masterful Subject.....156

Hope and the Cyborg.....160

The Land Ethic as an Embedded Discourse.....164

VI CONCLUSION.....171

Introduction.....171

Who We Are and Who We Are Not.....174

Future Research Directions.....176

REFERENCE LIST.....180

Chapter One

Introduction

Like many fields, outdoor recreation and education can be thought of as trying to improve the quality of human life. Even if it is simply through engaging in enjoyable recreation activities, research in outdoor recreation and education points to the restorative, re-creative benefits for individuals (Csikszentmihalyi and Kleiber, 1991; Haggard and Williams, 1991; McDonald and Schreyer, 1991). This field has another distinguishing element: outdoor recreation and education is also about the environment. Not only do practitioners and scholars in the field need to be conscious of the impacts the field has on participants, but also, I will argue, we need to pay attention to the impacts the field has on the environment.

The question I wish to explore is: What ethical frameworks, in relation to the environment, do two outdoor leaders/scholars employ and how do these frameworks exercise power as manifested in discursive fields. The analysis I bring to bear on this question proceeds on the assumption that there is no accessible Reality[1] in the sense of a world independent of human construction; reality *is* constructed but it is not idiosyncratic. That is, as humans, we all participate in a conventional level of reality that to some extent is shared with others. This conventional level of reality is the discursive; it pre-exists our individual entry into it and continues on after our departure. "Proponents of discourse theory... never say that the real is inexistent, especially in the sense of nature, but that no truth, ***no human truth*** can prevail and that– it must be emphasized–the world is not 'out

---

[1] I capitalize the word "Reality" in this case to distinguish it from "reality"; the former referring to the notion that there is something outside of human constructs that language can access, while the later refers to the constructed dimension of reality.

there' waiting for human symbols to make sense of it" (Conley, 1997, p.31). Discourse and discursive fields[2] do not refer

> to 'text' narrowly defined, but to the ensemble of the phenomena in and through which social production of meaning takes place, an ensemble which constitutes society as such. The discursive is not, therefore, being conceived as a level or even as a dimension of the social, but rather as being co-extensive with the social as such. This means that the discursive does not constitute a superstructure (since it is the very condition of all social practice) or, more precisely, that all social practice constitutes itself insofar as it produces meaning (Laclau, 1980, p.87).

Reality, then, is created or constructed, and our access to it is only through discursive fields. Discursive fields have the dual effects of enabling and constraining how reality is constructed. Because it is in discursive fields that reality is constructed, the reality we create is powerfully influenced by whatever field we manoeuver in. Outdoor professionals, like everyone, are not entirely free to choose whatever discursive reality they want. What outdoor professionals have available to them, in terms of different meanings toward nature, is conditioned by what other people have thought before, by prevailing political views and attitudes, and by other bodies of knowledge. These larger systems/forces are discursive fields that condition, not dictate, the meanings we give to

---

[2] In this thesis, discourse and discursive fields both refer to a conventional level of reality, however, discourse refers specifically to the meanings a particular individual engages in and constructs, while discursive fields are larger, pre-existing structures to which individual discourse connects.

terms. We understand meaning in reference to particular discursive fields. People familiar with the same discursive field communicate with one another through more or less shared systems of meanings.

When we, as humans, create meaning (in the discursively constrained sense of "create"), we create a framework for viewing the world and making our choices. To the extent that these frameworks influence how we see things, the choices we make, and the values we assign to the world around us, they are about power. Without the ability to ground meaning in Reality, power becomes the ability to alter meanings, values, actions, and to create both ourselves and the objects we value (although even this notion of subject/object split will later be problematised). In short, power creates, maintains, disrupts, or challenges what we take as reality and how we see the world. Laclau (1980) reminds us that everything social is discursive as it produces meaning, and, hence, it is in discursive fields and discourse (or society) that power is deployed.

The collapse of an accessible Reality raises important questions in relation to what is Real about the self or any object as we know it. Discourse theory begins to blur and destabilize what we mean by Real and props up, instead, created categories and meanings–more or less shared categories and meanings, but created none the less. In this discursive world, subjects and objects exist as discursively shared entities on a conventional level, not as ontological givens or absolutes we can directly access. Discourse pre-exists the subject/object distinction, and, in fact, creates these poles, while at an ontological level works to dismantle them. Discourse is larger than the single subject; it creates and props up the subject against the chasm created by the realization that

discourse (and ourselves) has no recourse (at an ontological level) to Reality (Conley, 1997, p.34).

The value of discursive theory lies with the ability to perceive alternatives that previously were not visible. When reality is given as an ontological absolute, meaning becomes the quest for Truth. Even though we might ask ourselves how a particular construction of the world is constraining or enabling, it becomes much harder to challenge or resist these views because they are the Truth about the world. It becomes a meaningless question to ask how one might imagine the world in other ways as the world is a static entity that we have accessed directly. The task, then, becomes the refinement of the precision with which we access that world, not an exploration of how we might reassess or resist certain meanings in an attempt to become more ethical in our view of the world. Shifting to "reality" from "Reality" reaffirms human agency's role in the playful re-creation of the future. It becomes possible for humans to engage positively or creatively in the construction of themselves and the world, rather than simply seeking out an already existing world.

As an example in outdoor recreation literature of the shift from "Reality" to "reality", Dustin, McAvoy, and Schultz (1995) speak of the power of language to alter the way we think about things, even create the very "things" we think about. These authors use the term "reification" to describe the process of "thingifying." Dustin, McAvoy and Schultz (1995) quote Condon who says: "The term 'reification' is used to describe the tendency to think that because there are certain words there must necessarily be certain 'things' that correspond to them. To reify is to 'thingify'" (p. 79). These authors state, for

example, "that there is no such 'thing' as a natural resource. There never has been and there never will be. That modern Western people behave as though there were is a result of many factors, not the least of which is our pattern of speech" (p. 78). Western people have created "natural resources" and seek evidence to support the idea of "natural resources" as things. As long as "natural resources" is taken as an ontological given, it becomes harder to understand how this constructs the world, or what consequences this reification has for other definitions of the world; it simply is the way the world is, no questions asked. The discourse of "natural resources" restricts other discourses by molding the world into pre-arranged, absolutely given categories.

For example, if certain types of land are natural resources, and we begin to see that this kind of land is in short supply, Dustin, McAvoy, and Schultz (1995) point out that, "we have been led by definition to believe that the wilderness resource is also limited" (p. 80). Seeing wilderness as being in short supply has lead to conservation organizations being "highly defensive...in arguing for the preservation of those remaining few areas that qualify for Wilderness designation" (p. 80). What constitutes "wilderness" is reified and restricted to certain meanings; other, differing meanings do not obtain saliency or currency within the framework of "natural resources."

Efforts to protect a reified notion of wilderness are not limited to conservation organizations. In outdoor recreation and education, there is often an emphasis on minimum impact as an expression of environmental ethics (Bonney and Drury, 1992; Cockrell, 1991; Cole, Hammond, and McCool, 1997; Drury & Massari, 1994; Hall, 1998; and Simpson, 1993). In these writings, ecology is often appealed to for the grounding of

minimum impact. Ecology can also be seen as reifying a certain view of the world. Ecology reifies ideas of ecosystems, and, by extension, what makes a healthy ecosystem. Ecosystems no more exist than do natural resources–it is an abstract term applied to the world. Given the assumption that ecosystems are Real, environmental ethics can become the quest to understand the ecology of the ecosystem in question. Environmental issues now get bottom-lined in ecological terms. For example, ecology is often used as a grounding for concepts such as carrying capacity, if the capacity is exceeded, damage will be done to the ecosystem (see Asimov and Pohl, 1991 for an example). What is needed, according to an ecological approach, is limitations on development and impact (what Zimmerman [1994] has called the reform environmentalist approach). Reform environmentalists feel Euro-North Americans need to curb their consumptive impulses and tread lightly in wilderness because science tells us this is what is good or right for the ecosystem. This has lead to the popular maxims of "take only pictures, leave only footprints" and "no trace camping."

The positive results for making a shift to a constructed reality are that we can change the way we view natural resources, wilderness, and ecology. Perhaps "wilderness" is not as limited as our language has lead us to believe. This is, in fact, what Dustin, McAvoy, and Schultz (1995) suggest. As long as wilderness stays reified, it remains in the restrictive realm of the Real. Humans do not have the ability to alter it, because it is something outside of our language, it Really exists, and what we think about it cannot alter it. Dustin, McAvoy and Schultz argue that seeing wilderness as an abstract concept applied to the world by humans means we can change it to include other areas beyond the

narrow specifications of the Wilderness Act (in the United States). "Recognition of this is crucial for those who are charged with the responsibility of planning wilderness recreation opportunities because it means that the wilderness resource is not as limited as we have been lead by our language to believe" (p. 80).

In terms of the reification of wilderness through the language of ecology, the shift to a constructed reality makes it possible to ask how minimum impact policies position the human subject. As van Wyck (1997) illustrates, when minimum impact policies are promoted, wilderness can get defined as being something without the antithetical human presence. The popular maxim of "take only photographs, leave only footprints," then, comes dangerously close to an ethic which states: Behave in wilderness as if you were not there–act to deny your presence. If this is the case, then humans become unnatural, something damaging to the world. This, in turn, is not far from seeing human beings as a blight upon the earth. A less extreme result is to see human action as inherently non-natural and urbanization as an expression of this non-natural or non-wilderness element of human action. There can be some serious effects to this thinking. For example, if cities are inherently non-natural, why try to increase the natural spaces within them? Should we worry about individual trees inside cities? Tribe (1986) asks some provocative questions about this very issue. If cities are inherently unnatural, is there anything wrong with plastic trees lining city boulevards? From a practical level plastic trees make some sense; they do not require water (a serious concern in California where water is scarce); they do not die; and they always remain green. Probably most outdoor professionals would inherently rebel against such a proposition, yet if our discourse reifies what nature is or what humans are,

this may lead us to focus so exclusively on wilderness as to dismiss urban space. When decisions are made about plastic trees in cities (and other related issues), will outdoor recreation/education professionals be one of the voices at the table? I suggest that if we do not examine how the discursive fields we engage in construct the world, we may not be.

Perhaps one way around the problem of conceptualizing cities and human action as non-natural is to blur the distinction of what human and non-human is. For example, Haraway (1991) employs the image of a cyborg (part human, part technology) as a means to blur the distinctions surrounding wilderness, nature, human, non-human, physical and non-physical. As technology begins to infiltrate the outdoor education and recreation field (i.e., high-tech gear and equipment, electronic locating devices, and better, more technologically advanced clothing), outdoor professionals have the opportunity to incorporate this technology into how we see ourselves. Setting wilderness as a pristine place without technology is to claim a clear distinction between nature and non-nature, and between humans and technology. The cyborg begins to question the certainty with which we can use the distinction between humans and technology as a defining characteristic of the human subject. This questioning re-positions a de-centred human subject in the midst of a shifting, constructed, and contested world rather than as a reified, static concept in a stable world. The details and implications of this and other discursive manoeuvres are the subject of the literature review and are an attempt open the world to being re-conceived in different ways.

Shifting to a constructed and contested discursive view of the world also problematises issues of power, because power is now not the purview of a person or an

object, as even this distinction is blurred. Power moves through discursive fields in creative and formative ways that are not reducible to a single originary position.(see Clegg, 1989; Dreyfus and Rabinow, 1982; Foucault, 1977; Orlie, 1997 for a more in-depth discussion of power). Attempts to locate power in a single person need to be abandoned, and the focus should instead turn toward the effects of power, the way(s) power is used, and the way(s) it is brokered by individuals, systems, and discourses.

Power positions ourselves and things around us. It is productive; it produces meanings, opportunities, and legitimations of certain views; it draws up, maintains, and challenges discursive boundaries. These boundaries have real physical effects in the world. As Conley (1997) remarks of Lévi-Strauss,

> without denying the existence of a 'real', he shows how it is always organized through language that changes no less than the world it is said to represent. It follows that different ideologies, or ways that language imagines the world, have differing impacts on nature. And the ideology upon which the autonomous, masterful subject was founded in the post-Cartesian era has proven disastrous to many humans and nature (p.42-43).

Grand narratives (Zimmerman, 1994), such as the Cartesian ideology, discursively create the world in powerful ways. They influence not only the way the world is seen and valued, but also actions taken in that world. It is part of the power of discursive fields and grand narratives to proscribe certain actions and value systems. Grand narratives give weight to certain frameworks and reduce the currency of others. For outdoor professionals, these

narratives construct certain views of nature (as in a definition of wilderness and human that make each one exclusive to the other) and draft certain proscriptions about proper (ethical) behaviour in wilderness (as in minimum impact policies).

As we shall see, there are possibilities for resisting or challenging such proscriptions regarding nature or any other discursive element. Sites of resistence or rupture prove very fruitful in understanding how power is deployed to create meaning, for it is here that new couplings can take place. When proscriptive notions of meaning are resisted or ruptured, what can emerge on the other side are new meanings and new understandings as ideas, images, and thoughts not normally associated together are brought into proximity. For example, by resisting the discourse of "natural resources," we can now associate other areas as "wilderness," which allows us to act to protect other spaces not previously thought of as "natural resources." It should be mentioned that the choice here is not an either/or. We do not either accept unethical discursive proscriptions or challenge them. Rather, in coming to see how it is that a discursive field conditions the way we construct the world, we can then decide more consciously whether and in what ways we might wish to support this construction. It might very well be that I continue to support minimum impact practices even though some aspects of it might lead to a construction of humans as unnatural. What has changed is how I support these practices and how I work to re-define what it means to be human while still attempting to tread lightly in the wilderness.

Let us turn now to a hypothetical example of a situation many outdoor leaders have faced and explore some of the implications of a discursive deployment of power

through environmental ethics. A leader of a trip may be enforcing minimum impact techniques as an attempt at ethical behaviour toward the environment, yet requiring people to behave in ways that cause stress and/or fear (i.e., enforcing a distance of 150 feet back in the bush for washing dishes at night in the bugs) may not be ethical toward humans. As an alternative, this leader, being concerned with the negative reactions in the participant toward late night dish washing in the bugs, might allow 50 feet instead. As another possibility, s/he might feel that facing issues of fear and/or learning that wilderness is not always comfortable is positive for the participant and, therefore, be more strict with the 150 foot policy but include a debriefing session on managing fear and stress. Or, s/he might suggest washing dishes in the morning in order to avoid the night entirely. A fifth possibility would be to open the discussion up to the group. The leader in this case would serve as a resource, providing information and suggestions, but leaving the decision with the group.

There are many possible responses to the issues of washing dishes at night. What I wish to draw attention to are how each response defines wilderness, humans, natural, and good; how these choices have embedded in them particular answers to questions of what a wilderness experience should be; and how humans should be behaving when out in the wilderness (however defined). Answers to questions like these begin to access an environmental ethic–a system or framework for structuring, acting, and making decisions in the world around us.

Ethical frameworks create and maintain meanings, and, in so doing, draw boundaries that say nature, for example, includes hardship and discomfort (i.e., hardship is

a natural process because many animals suffer hardship during lean winters). This meaning of nature positions it opposite to cities and other human constructs that seek to remove the hardships of "the wild" (i.e., heated houses in winter, air conditioned cars in the summer). Given a meaning for nature that includes hardship as integral, the leader in the above scenario might feel that it would be good for the participants to endure washing dishes at night in the bugs as a means to separate the experience further from life in the city.

The meanings a leader constructs for nature or wilderness form the foundation from which to choose actions. In this sense, how we structure the world is more than just idle talk or belief– there are real, physical, and political effects. McLean (1997) cautions that leisure behaviour (which includes outdoor recreation and education) can be judged ethical based on unacceptable border lines or criteria for what is ethical (i.e., anything freely chosen is good), which can lead to forms of deviant leisure being seen as ethical (i.e., vandalism). McLean suggests that one way we can begin to understand what ethical border lines we have painted around leisure is to examine leaders in the field, experts, and people with experience to see what kind of ethic they hold. If outdoor professionals wish to be ethical, it is not enough to simply decide if a certain action is ethical or not; we also need to explore the criteria we set for what is ethical in the first place. The first step is to bring to light the ethical frameworks leaders in the field have and investigate some of the consequences of these frameworks–What are the border lines we paint around ethical outdoor behaviour? As outdoor professionals, we need to be examining the way(s) we "world" the world through our imagination (Ridd, 1994). How are we putting together the world? What meanings are we giving to ourselves and to things around us? And finally,

how are these meanings connected through exercises of power? Examining these questions can help us see the ways in which we are discursively constrained as well as open up possibilities for resistence or rupture of those conditions. If we decide to change our ethical frameworks, it occurs through exercises of power that resist or disrupt current frameworks[3]. As this discursive constraining and resisting has real, political effects, examining discursive fields and power is crucial for those outdoor professionals who wish to live in a world (and even help create one) less riddled with environmental oppression and abuse.

The two leaders/scholars in this study (Bob Henderson and Leo McAvoy) both perform an ethic in a discursive field, and both are prominent members in the realm of outdoor recreation/education discourse. Each of the participants hold tenured positions at universities, teach outdoor education/recreation, lead trips with university students, and publish writings on wilderness/environmental issues. Bob Henderson is based out of McMaster University (Kinesiology department), while Leo McAvoy works at the University of Minnesota (Department of Recreation, Park, and Leisure Studies).

The writings of both leaders/scholars are varied. Bob Henderson, for example, has written on applying deep ecology to environmental education (Henderson, 1994, 1996). He has also been developing notions of how language influences our perception of nature (1997b, 1998), how games can be used to deliver outdoor education programmes (1997a), and how historical stories illustrate various relationships with the land (1993). These

---

[3] Even if we still decide to act in support of certain beliefs or aspects of our frameworks, the reasons behind our support can change. In this sense we still are exercising power in a resistive sense, although our surface behaviour has not changed.

different aspects of Bob's writing revolve around attempts at creating a relationship with nature or the earth and, as such, promote an environmental ethical framework(s).

The second leader/scholar in this research project, Leo McAvoy, has written on the need for a *worth ethic* for park and recreation professionals (Dustin, McAvoy, & Schultz, 1995; and McAvoy, 1990a), the need for undeveloped wilderness areas (McAvoy, 1987 and McAvoy & Dustin, 1989), integrated outdoor education programmes (Schleien, McAvoy, Lais, & Rynders, 1993), and the responsibility of park and recreation professionals to promote ethical use of wilderness (Dustin & McAvoy, 1987; Dustin, McAvoy, & Rankin, 1991; and Dustin, McAvoy, & Schultz, 1991). Recently, McAvoy has focussed attention on Native American land ethics, suggesting park and recreation professional need to gain more understanding of the ways Native Americans relate to nature (Jostad, McAvoy, & McDonald, 1996; McDonald & McAvoy, 1996).

Because of the amount of their published writing, the courses both participants teach at university, and the trips each leads (all of which are markers of influence and position), Bob and Leo can be positioned as exemplary in the outdoor education/recreation field. Through an analysis of leaders/scholars that our field deem influential and exemplary, this thesis has the potential to shed light on the overall values and discursive systems of our field. In exploring how Bob and Leo deploy power in their discourse, other outdoor professionals may also gain insight(s) into ways they deploy power in their own discourse and some of the consequences that might result. In any case, by raising issues such as these, this thesis provides an opportunity to increase overall sensitivity and depth of understanding of power in discursive fields, and the attempts to extend legitimation of

privileged discursive constructions onto the world.

Chapter Two of this thesis is a literature review of the discursive field of outdoor education and recreation designed to situate the discourse of the two leaders/scholars in the study, an overview of the environmental ethics literature that the two participants use to ground their own ethical frameworks, and, thirdly, an examination of literature that engages environmental ethics in an attempt to excavate how power is deployed. There are numerous connections that run between these three areas (outdoor education/recreation, environmental ethics, and critical analyses) that suggest investigating outdoor education/recreation's use of ethical frameworks in terms of power could increase our understanding of some of the consequences of power. The literature of outdoor education and recreation illustrates a number of current topics surrounding environmental issues such as minimum impact, wilderness protection and designation, park and recreation professionals' responsibilities toward the natural environment, and outdoor educators's attempts at developing a connection between people and the environment. These topics have much in common with the philosophical literature in environmental ethics, which often set out a framework for a relationship between humans and the environment and our responsibilities toward that environment. This thesis seeks to extend the literature that examines how power is deployed in environmental ethics frameworks (i.e., Conley, 1997; Haraway, 1991; van Wyck, 1997; Zimmerman, 1994) into an examination of power in outdoor education and recreation. For example, Zimmerman (1994) has argued that deep ecology can be read as containing grand narratives that rely on progressive readings of history and are at odds with some of its very basic tenets. One of the main tenets of deep

ecology is the bettering of humankind through an identification of the self with all of creation. This belief in bettering humankind is a progressive notion, which Zimmerman argues rests upon Enlightenment ideals. Enlightenment ideals, Zimmerman continues, have contributed to seeing nature as resource for the productions of culture and are exactly what many deep ecologists are seeking to escape. Some of the same concerns might be raised toward aspects of the outdoor education/recreation discourse.

Both outdoor education/recreation and environmental philosophy are discursive fields and as such exercise power. If discursive fields in environmental philosophy are subject to a critical analysis in terms of the deployment of power and production of meaning, it makes sense that discursive fields in outdoor education and recreation could also be subjected to a similar analysis. In addition, both fields define what nature, environment, and human is, and an analysis that has explored how environmental philosophy constructs the world, might also shed light on outdoor education/recreation's construction of the world. Thirdly, as professionals in outdoor education/recreation use terms and concepts from environmental philosophy as the grounding for action and values, we should be aware of critiques of the frameworks we ground our discourse in. And lastly, the world that outdoor professionals inhabit is a shifting, multicultural, technological world. The literature that critically analyses some of the effects of discursive power in such a world can be applied to our own field as a means of understanding in more depth the implications of our ethical frameworks. In bringing some of the critiques of Haraway (1991), Orlie (1997), van Wyck (1997), and Zimmerman (1994), this thesis begins to explore some issues surrounding the ethical frameworks and ethical actions of the outdoor

education/recreation profession.

The fourth and fifth chapters of this thesis attempt a difficult walk between recognizing the individual elements of the work both Bob and Leo are engaged in, while at the same time examining some of the larger discursive issues of power. Not only is there a distinction between individual and discursive field elements, but, as Orlie (1997) has suggested, all actions contain consequences that can be seen as good and bad, and the outdoor professional is no exception. In order to both act and theorize in a more ethical manner, outdoor professionals must engage both the discursively created good and bad aspects of their individual discourse as well as that of the discursive field. We need to look for sites to resist and rupture what we perceive as the negative elements without becoming despondent. As an outdoor leader and scholar myself, I sympathize with the need to become more ethical in our thoughts, actions, and beliefs toward the environment, and one way to do so is to examine our discourse in a more critical light.

The discourse produced by the two individuals in this study provides an entry point into the discursive field of environmental ethics and outdoor education/recreation. This type of critical interpretive approach complexifies the issue of ethics; it suggests that the participants of this study, like all outdoor professionals, produce and are produced by discourse that contains mixed results and implications. Just like the well intentioned deep ecologists Zimmerman (1994) speaks of, outdoor professionals replicate both positive and negative elements of larger discursive fields. Such an examination of the discourse of environmental ethics and outdoor education/recreation suggests that ethical action might be more about careful thinking and asking tough questions of ourselves, than finding the

one right answer or framework.

Both Bob and Leo live and operate in a complex world, and the search for single, unitary answers becomes a mythic fantasy (and a potentially damaging one as alternatives, complexity and diversity are overshadowed in the quest for unity). Bob and Leo carefully employ discourse and position themselves sensitively in relation to the environment. To see their discourse (and/or they themselves) as otherwise is an injustice to their struggles. These issues of environmental concern and ethical action are, for both of them, crucial. Any analysis that sees Bob or Leo as either good or bad people, or seeks to place blame and responsibility in a directly culpable fashion, misses the complexity of the discursive level and is a miss-reading of this focus of this thesis. The analysis I undertake is of the discursive field as manifested by and through the two participants, not an analysis of either of them as individuals. The discursive field of outdoor education and recreation is played out through Bob's and Leo's discourse. Even though both are important individuals in this field, the discourse of Bob and Leo is constrained in ways beyond their control by the larger level of the discursive field. Both Bob and Leo engage a discourse, engender sites of resistence, and create meanings that are enabling and seek to reduce the dominations of class, race, gender, and status. But equally, meanings can have unwanted and unknowable consequences, negative outcomes, or limit other's possibilities in the world. These outcomes result, in part, because discourse is larger than an individual, and power circulates through action. It does not reside in people, hence, actions can contain powers and effects not of our choosing, and beyond our control.

Before moving into the literature review, a few words need to be said concerning

language. This thesis is an analysis of discourse, hence, words and language become of the utmost importance. Words we use to describe the world around us and ourselves are not neutral. They have contested and unstable meanings and mobilize power to discursively position the human subject and objects around it. Some discourses even problematise the dualistic split of object and subject, suggesting difficulties in perceiving the world in this way. Different discourses construct terms like human, nature, and culture differently. A discursive field analysis, such as the one I am undertaking, is more about investigating the various ways the meanings of these terms are constructed rather than uncovering their "True" meaning. As such, it becomes critical to be clear on the particular mobilization of such terms. Whenever terms such as "nature," "wilderness," "backcountry," or "urban" are used in this thesis, I will endeavour to situate how they are used and to what referent(s) each term is attached, before moving to an examination of the power exercised through such discursive positioning.

Chapter Two:
Literature Review

Introduction

This literature review has three main parts: an examination of the discursive field of outdoor education and recreation, an overview of the relevant philosophical writings on environmental ethics, and an investigation of some postmodern discourse as it bears on environmental ethics. The first part focuses on the discursive fields of environmental/outdoor education, which speaks of the importance of developing a personal connection with nature as a means for encouraging an environmental ethic. The literature of outdoor recreation, also reviewed in this section, emphasizes minimum impact practices as an outgrowth of an environmental ethic and the responsibility of park and recreation professionals in helping develop and communicate an environmental ethic to the public. Some of the ethical frameworks in the outdoor education and recreation literature are derived from philosophy, and, hence, an investigation into the literature from environmental philosophy is warranted in order to better understand these frameworks. The second section of the literature review focuses on the relevant environmental ethics in philosophy in order to provide a background against which to begin to analyse the environmental ethics found in the discursive field of outdoor education and recreation. There are numerous environmental ethics in philosophy and only those frameworks which the outdoor leaders/scholars in this study bring into their own discourse will be considered. The two frameworks that are relevant for this thesis, and, therefore, the only ones included in the literature review, are deep ecology and the land ethic. In the third section, I examine

some of the insights from several critical postmodern authors. These authors have engaged various environmental ethics discourse in critiques similar to my project with the discourse of outdoor leaders/scholars. As Chapter Five will show, these critiques of the discursive field of environmental ethics can fruitfully be applied to environmental ethics in outdoor recreation/education as illustrated through the two participants.

The Literature from Outdoor Education/Recreation

Outdoor Education

Teachers and leaders who focus on the educational value of nature frequently place an emphasis on environmental ethics, which are often thought to be best developed through direct contact with nature (Cohen, 1995; Kraft, 1992; Matthews, 1993, 1994; Matthews & Riley, 1995; McRae, 1985, 1986; Parker, 1993; Priest, 1993; Quinn, 1992/93; Williams, 1989; Yaple, 1993). These authors believe that learning about nature can develop an appreciation of and relationship with the environment. Quinn and Scott (1997) cite growing evidence that personal contact with nature "is the single most important factor in the development of a personal concern for the environment" (p. 64). Coupled with this is Simpson's (1996) assertion that "outdoor recreation is contemporary society's most direct contact with the natural world" (p.19) (see also Ewert, 1996), making outdoor recreation and education a powerful tool in developing personal concern for the environment in the wider public. While an environmental ethical framework is more than just concern of nature, solicitude does seem to operate as a cornerstone in many ethical frameworks that outdoor leaders and scholars espouse in this literature review.

The type of and rationale for direct contact with nature that outdoor educators espouse comes in different forms. For some educators, games and observation provide the means for experiencing nature (Cornell, 1979, 1989; Henderson, 1997b, van Matre 1974, 1979; van Matre & Johnson, 1987). For Cornell (1989), nature is a magical place that through exploration children can come to love and respect:

> If we want to develop an attitude of reverence for life, we need to begin with awareness, which in turn can lead to loving empathy. As we begin to feel our common bond of life with living things around us, our actions become more harmonious in an unforced, natural way, and we become concerned for the needs and well-being of all creatures (p.14).

Cornell suggests a number of activities designed to introduce students (mostly children) to the joys and wonder of nature in an attempt to foster a sense of caring and respect. The contact Cornell promotes is designed to have students begin to understand nature, which is seen as leading to respect and care. An ethic grounded in love, respect and an understanding of a common bond with nature can be developed through personal contact with nature, but Cornell does not explain why or how these links occur. Introducing people to nature is seen as necessary in developing respect, but what exactly respect is, how it should be mobilized, and why it arises from contact with nature is unclear. Cohen (1995) also suggests that personal connection with nature is needed to develop care and respect. He encourages students to find an area in nature they are attracted to and "sit in that area, or explore it for 10 minutes... try to really know it in as many ways as possible, including with your eyes closed" (p.10). For educators like Cohen and Cornell, direct

sensory contact with nature, coupled with some interpretation from the leader, develops a personal relationship with nature. This relationship is an emotional one grounded in love, respect, care, wonderment, and curiosity, which can lead to reverence for all living creatures.

Van Matre (1974, 1979) and van Matre and Johnson (1987) have developed programmes that construct an ecological necessity out of living lightly on the earth, and then teach children (and adults) to recognize this. The programmes, Acclimatization, Sunship Earth, and Earth Keepers, are promoted by the group Earth Education whose goal "is the process of helping people live more harmoniously and joyously with the natural world" (van Matre & Johnson, 1987, p. 5). Earth Education is needed "simply because the human passengers on board the planet earth are endangering other living things that share the planet with them and their life support systems in the process" (van Matre & Johnson, 1987, p. 5). Earth Education uses certain metaphors in its discourse that makes it distinct from the approach that engages a participant emotionally or psychologically with nature. For Earth Educators, the earth becomes a spaceship, a vessel, we are dependent upon. This powerful metaphor enables Earth Educators to position humans alongside other passengers. Any creature (human or otherwise) is now on an equal footing with respect to the spaceship (the earth). Human activity that endangers the spaceship becomes unethical because at a larger level we are just passengers and have no right to destroy the vehicle that other passengers depend upon. The metaphor of "spaceship earth" owes much to the discourse of ecology, particularly the concept of Gaia. The word "Gaia" was developed by the ecologist, James Lovelock, to explain his theory of

a planet-wide organism (Asimov and Pohl, 1991). Lovelock suggested that the whole earth could usefully be described as one organism, exhibiting some of the same qualities as other organisms (i.e., self-ordering and a seeking of homeostasis). Earth Education programmes have adopted the theory of Gaia and added a moral overtone to it. For Earth Educators, with the acceptance of Gaia, comes the ecological necessity of living lightly on the earth. Earth Education programmes focus on increasing understanding of Gaia among their participants and fostering a sense of responsibility for leading a type of life that will reduce the damage to other passengers on-board spaceship earth.

A similar approach to Earth Education, the Rediscovery programme, has also been run at camps. The focus of this programme is on direct sensory contact with nature, but, in contrast to Earth Education, the goal is teach ecology secondarily to Native culture and history (Henley, 1989). Participants need not be Native, however, the programme was originally designed around a Haida village on Vancouver Island and incorporates the wisdom of the Elders in the community. Based on the premise that many young Natives in urban areas are losing touch with their traditional roots and culture, Rediscovery shifts the focus to recovering this connection. Ecology and environmental ethics become tied to Native spirituality and world view. The Medicine Wheel, the four directions, and story-telling become important parts in developing an environmental ethic. (Although it must be emphasized that to separate out environmental ethics from the spiritual, cultural, and historic aspects of the Rediscovery programme may not be simple as Native culture can be more integrated than this division would suggest) On the surface, the Rediscovery programme, with its emphasis on direct contact with nature, may look similar to the

approaches of Cornell (1979, 1989), Cohen (1995), and van Matre (1974, 1979), but, by focussing on cultural connections, historic roots, and spirituality, the rationale behind the contact with nature is profoundly different.

Outdoor education also focuses often on curriculum development in schools and developing knowledge related to the natural environment (i.e., Attarian, 1997; Caudell, 1996; Knapp, 1992, 1996; Kroll, 1995; Teutsch, 1998). Outdoor educators who turn more toward schools and curriculum often define schools as "any public or private institution with a mandate to educate people over a reasonably long term" (Horwood, 1996, p. 9). Coupling this with a broad definition of outdoor education as including any attempt to educate people in the out of doors leads to the inclusion of grade schools, universities, colleges, and technical institutes as sites for outdoor education, but not organizations such as Outward Bound as they have the students only for a relatively short duration. A curriculum-based approach places these outdoor educators closer to more traditional educators (i.e., teachers), because the duration of contact often spans an entire year (i.e., a grade or university year), and the goal is more heavily the creation of knowledge in the students.

Knapp (1996) is one example of such an approach toward outdoor education. The curriculum topics Knapp discusses vary, but a central one is teaching ecological concepts and issues. The method for teaching about these issues "is best described as experiential learning, and it consists of four distinct segments: (a) active student involvement in a meaningful and challenging experience, (b) reflection upon the experience individually and in a group, (c) the development of new knowledge about the world, and (d) application of

this knowledge to a new situation" (Knapp, 1996, p. 2). Cohen's (1995) reflections after the solo and Cornell's (1989) games and activities, which bring children into direct contact with nature, are outgrowths of Knapp's curriculum-based outdoor education. Outdoor educators such as Cohen (1995), Cornell (1989), and van Matre (1979) have taken the more formal curriculum approach of Knapp and applied it in less structured settings such as camps and interpretive programmes. Outdoor educators who work within the formal education system have more of an emphasis on creating knowledge. Certainly experiential education in schools needs to be engaging, but the goal is not just to create a relationship based on love and a sense of magical wonder. Rather it is engaging ecological knowledge that leads to awareness and appreciation that is sought.

Knapp (1996) relates didactic elements of the programmes to areas such as math, social studies, language arts, and science, to which Horwood (1996) adds "co-operation, creativity, fitness, craft-ship, [and] community" (p.9). For these authors, the emphasis is on creating knowledge in diverse areas, less curriculum-based outdoor educators also seek to create knowledge, but it is less structured, and the focus has shifted to include more emphasis on the emotive aspects of outdoor education. School-based outdoor educators focus on engaging learning: "knowledge is so much more than the memorization of chemical tables, species lists, or geographic boundaries. It is that which comes from touching, tasting, smelling and feeling a 'loved' environment over an extended period of time. It is not studying 'about' something, it is falling in love 'with' something" (Kraft, 1992, p.10). Direct contact with nature over an extended period of time leads to the creation of a type of knowledge quite different from mainstream educational institutions.

For Knapp (1992), there is an emphasis on the role experience plays in teaching the students, which separates him from more abstract types of learning in school. School-based outdoor education is also distinct from the approaches of outdoor educators who have less of a curriculum to contend with and are, therefore, more free to emphasize the creation of emotional and psychological bonds with nature. It is this quest for a particular type of knowledge that separates curriculum-based outdoor educators from more cultural/spiritual or psychological/emotional approaches.

The divisions between these approaches are not always clear and definite. It should be noted that although there are some differences between the above mentioned outdoor education approaches, there are also overlaps and similarities. As an example, it would be unfair to say that Earth Education, for instance, has no connection with more curriculum-based approaches. Both Earth Education and outdoor educators like Knapp and Kraft seek to create knowledge that moves the person. Knowledge needs to be engaging rather than just memorization; ecology becomes more than simply knowing the what and why's of an ecosystem. For Earth Education, the reasons are clear–if we do not stop destroying spaceship earth, we will all perish. Curriculum-based approaches can also ground their approaches with similar reasons (i.e., Krapfel, 1989). Education is the concept that links many of these approaches. Most outdoor educators seek to educate people in ways that are distinct from traditional schooling. The goal is learning, but the learning for outdoor educators needs to be engaging and emotional, not just ecological.

Another approach used to help participants develop a personal relationship with nature is based on deep ecology (e.g., Henderson, 1994, 1996; Horwood, 1991a, 1991b;

Horwood & Henderson, 1995; LaChapelle, 1991; Prochaska, 1994; Wignall & Henderson, 1994). This approach is characterized by an overt linking to the language of deep ecology. Outdoor educators who support deep ecology wish to develop a personal connection with nature (which is similar to the emotional/psychological type of connections Cornell encourages); yet a deep ecology approach ties the rationale behind developing this personal relationship with nature to larger and more theoretical issues. LaChapelle (1991) suggests that after the industrial revolution, the Western world began to see reality as substance, and "defined human good as the production and buying of more 'things' and this has been going on for at least the last four hundred years" (p. 18). She argues, instead, that we should focus on our entire history in which "human good was the finding and celebrating of ever deeper ties to the surrounding land including the animals, the sky, and the plants" (p.18). When this attitude is transferred to outdoor education activities, one of the results is a recognition of "affordances." Instead of seeing climbing as conquering the mountain, LaChapelle prefers to "help people to see that the mountain 'affords' their passage. And when they have done a particularly difficult move we say the mountain lets them do it. Such experiences develop a very intense love for the mountain and often change their lives" (p.20). Similarly, both Horwood and Henderson (1995) and Wignall and Henderson (1994) describe the differences between the type of connections with nature developed through more science-based approaches and those based on stories and parables (which they suggest are related to a deep ecological view of the world). According to these authors, science proceeds under the inquiry of power. It asks "why" questions and thus frames the answers in certain ways, while stories ask "how" questions

and proceed under the inquiry of wonder (Horwood and Henderson, 1995). Both Horwood and Henderson (1995) and Wignall and Henderson (1994) feel that the differences between science and story stem from Western civilization's quest for knowledge. The Cartesian world view of a rational, order universe leads to an inquiry of power, while reducing other types of knowledge to "mere" story or fable. These authors wish to revive alternative methods for creating knowledge, methods that promote ans develop a personal connection with nature. A deep ecology perspective can lead to the view that science splits the person from nature. Scientists study nature; they are not part of it. As Henderson (1998) states, even the very language of science and Euro-North American culture separates the human subject from the world. He proposes that outdoor educators look for ways to change our language (or incorporate terms from other languages) to reflect that humans are one with the world–we are of the same stuff as nature, we are not separate or above it.

Outdoor Recreation

The next area of the literature review centres on outdoor recreation, specifically trip leaders and guides, programmes designed to train leaders (e.g., Wilderness Education Association and The National Outdoor Leadership School), as well as land and resource managers. This literature has two foci that are relevant here: (1) Research into the importance and role, for outdoor leaders, resource managers, and recreation professionals of ethics generally and environmental ethics specifically, and (2) literature that indicates an emphasis on minimum impact techniques as an enactment of an environmental ethic.

The literature on outdoor leaders supports the importance of ethics in various areas including: professional ethics (Hunt, 1995; Priest & Gass, 1997), feminist ethics (Mitten, 1995), leadership ethics (Fox & McAvoy, 1995; Fox & Reed, 1994; Lehmann, 1991), ethics surrounding culture and ethnicity (Dustin, Knopf, & Fox, 1993; Ewert, 1993), and ethics related to liability (Priest & Baille, 1995). In addition to these areas, some researchers have suggested that environmental ethics are also important.

Priest and Gass (1997) have indicated that with the recent participation in outdoor recreation increasing at a dramatic rate, we can expect more regulation by governing and accrediting bodies (i.e., American Mountain Guides Association) in efforts to protect the wilderness areas hit most heavily by increased users. For Priest and Gass, environmental ethics takes the form of external (and sometimes internal) regulations and restrictions on users and programmes in wilderness areas. Another type of ethic Priest and Gass outline responds to issues of crowding and the loss of feelings of remoteness in wilderness. The popularizing of wilderness brings more people into it. Paradoxically, many of these people are seeking to escape densely populated urban centres but now face large crowds on hiking trails and rivers. In response to this, Priest and Gass say, some outdoor recreation scholars have proposed no rescue wilderness areas (i.e., Dustin and McAvoy, 1981; McAvoy, 1990b) that hopefully would cut down on the amount of uses through a given area. A no rescue wilderness area might increase the risk enough to stop many people from travelling there: only experts and those willing to pay the money for a private rescue would venture out. Although a relatively short section, Priest and Gass indicate the importance of taking care and giving thought to environmental issues as user levels

increase. They have clear feelings on the state of the environment: "No question about it, the environment is 'reeling' from the actions of many untrained people" (p.297). For these authors, environmental ethics are mainly issues about no rescue areas, but there is more to ethics than this as other researchers have indicated.

Ewert and Priest (1990), Priest (1987), and Fox and McAvoy (1995) conducted research into the important qualities and ethics of outdoor leaders. One area these studies identified as important to outdoor leaders was environmental ethics. While interviewing nine outdoor leaders in Canada and the United States to explore their ethical frameworks, Fox and McAvoy (1995) found that "the definition of an environmental ethic ranged widely among the outdoor leaders interviewed. Some saw the natural environment as a locale for other activities in need of protection while others described a deeper, more spiritual connection with the natural environment" (p.71). Hunt (1990) supports this diversity in ethical frameworks regarding the environment by explaining, through the use of hypothetical examples, how different ethical frameworks might lead persons to respond differently to ethical dilemmas. These studies suggest that environmental ethics is an important area for outdoor leaders to be versed in and that there are a variety of frameworks outdoor leaders employ. The next step would be to follow this up with an exploration of what the ethical frameworks some outdoor leaders do engage in–a step this thesis begins.

Organizations that train outdoor leaders also write about environmental ethics. The Wilderness Education Association (WEA) is an important organization for the training and certifying of outdoor leaders, and scholars have written on its program, philosophy, and

specific skill units for its courses (Bonney & Drury, 1992; Cockrell, 1991; Drury & Massari, 1994). Through such material, these authors show how the WEA supports an environmental ethic in the form of minimum impact wilderness travel. The WEA curriculum includes lesson plans covering minimum impact techniques on all of its trips and speaks of the value of minimum impact techniques in preventing damage to the wilderness, thus ensuring the continued existence of wilderness areas. Including sections on minimizing the impacts to the wilderness on all trips is more than just smart business sense; a minimum impact policy is often based on the notion that nature itself is worth treating carefully. Valuing nature for its own sake is part of an environmental ethic (in addition to a business ethic), and, as Simpson (1993) states, a marker for the internalization of that ethic is minimum impact wilderness use.

The National Outdoor Leadership School (NOLS), which is one of the larger outdoor organization, collects and sponsors research into the importance of minimum impact (Cole, 1995a, 1995b, 1996; Cilimburg & Monz, 1997; Hammitt, Freimund, Watson, Brod & Monz, 1994; Monz, Cole, Johnson & Spildie, 1994; Monz, Meier, Cole & Welker, 1994; Warren, G., 1998; Watson & Niccolucci, 1995; Williams & Monz, 1994). Much of this research focuses on the impacts of various types of visitor use on wilderness areas. One of the main areas of study is the trampling impacts that hikers and other users have on vegetation. Monz, Cole, Johnson, and Spildie (1994) conducted an experiment on the Wind River Range (an area used by NOLS to train outdoor leaders) of the effects trampling has on the recovery rates of five native plant species. They marked off plots of land and conducted controlled trampling to test the recovery rates. This and

another study by Monz, Meier, Cole, and Welker (1994) on arctic tundra response to trampling were designed to "develop low-impact backcountry recommendations, provide BLM [Bureau of Land Management] and other agencies with additional information for the continued development of management strategies" (on-line).

Cole (1995a, 1995b) has also conducted research into the effects of trampling on vegetation. Cole (1995b) extends the Monz, Meier et al (1994) and Monz, Cole et al (1994) studies of trampling to include specifications for weight and shoe type of users. In the other study (Cole, 1995a), Cole conducted overnight stays ranging from one to four nights on specific plots and then measured the impacts immediately after camping and then one year following. The efforts of studies on trampling effects are to determine acceptable use and impact levels on various wilderness areas and provide management strategies to reduce these impacts to acceptable levels.

In a review of the trends in wilderness use and impacts, Cole (1996) found that use has increased six fold since the Wilderness Act of 1964, but the impacts on long-established, hardened sites has changed little. It is the aggregate campsite impacts that have increased dramatically (53-123%) due to the extraordinary increase in number of campsites. As Cole notes, "these findings suggest that problems with wilderness recreation are pronounced and increasing. More investment by management and commitment to dealing with problems is needed to meet wilderness recreation management goals" (on-line).Warren (1998) also found that in the recreational use of the Bob Marshall, Great Bear, and Scapegoat Wilderness areas the number of impacted sites and aircraft landings was above recommended limits. Warren indicates that the primary tool for reducing these

unwanted impacts is through the encouragement of "Leave No Trace" camping practices. He advocates educational methods by resource managers to inform wilderness users of low impact practices. Similarly, Cole, Hammond, and McCool (1997) investigated the impacts that trailside bulletin board messages containing minimum impact information had on users and found that education was more effective if number of messages remained low. As the number of minimum impact messages increased, user retention rates decreased. Cole, Hammond, and McCool suggest that although education about minimum impact practices is important, it is not always a guarantee of behaviour. The goals of such wilderness management strategies, recommended by Cole (1996), Cole, Hammond, and McCool (1997), and Warren (1998), are to preserve wilderness areas as a state consistent with their designation as wilderness by the Wilderness Act.

While there is a heavy emphasis in the outdoor recreation literature on minimum impact practices as an enactment of an environmental ethic, there has been some movement into other areas. One publication in particular stands out amidst the literature: Stewards of Access/Custodians of Choice (Dustin, McAvoy, & Schultz, 1995). In this book, Dustin et al set out an ethical framework that extends beyond the practice of minimum impact and into the rationale behind why we would want to and why we should relate to the environment in certain ways. These authors suggest that what is needed is a "worth ethic."

Starting with Garrett Hardin's (1968) concept of the "tragedy of the commons," Dustin et al illustrate how individualist notions of maximizing the benefits of common areas (i.e., any public land or wilderness area) lead rapidly to a depletion of that land's

resources. The tragedy is that if everyone acts in ways to benefit themselves, the collective action leads to an unsustainable level of resource depletion. In essence the issue is increasing demands made on limited resources. "What each villager fails to recognize, however, is that every other villager is following the same logic, and that the cumulative effects of their independently logical action is bound to be the destruction of the pasture" (Dustin et al, 1995, p.10).

Dustin, McAvoy, and Schultz (1995) transfer this tragedy of the commons to a recreation setting suggesting that the individualistic perspective will lead an individual, who wishes to escape the heat and congestion of the city, to pack up his or her family and head out to the nearest public recreation area. But consider the implication of the thousand others who also wish the same escape, and you have the tragedy of the commons. Compounded here is the reluctance of park and recreation professionals to limit or exclude people from visiting places that legally belong to everyone. Notions of individual freedom (something heavily emphasised in American culture) make public restriction a difficult concept to justify. In addition, the park and recreation profession prides itself on being sensitive to and striving to meet the demands of the public (Dustin et al, 1995, p. 25), and hence is caught between wanting to protect the land and serve the public[4]. Dustin et al suggest that one alternative would be to develop a "worth ethic" in the American public.

---

[4] This notion of individual freedom complicates the park and recreation profession in the United States of America, however, in Canada individual freedom is emphasised less. Park and recreation professionals in Canada must contend with a mandate in National Parks to both preserve the environment, yet also encourage tourism and development. Many of the issues and debates surrounding National Parks in Canada concern the competing demands of tourist development and preservation of the natural area (Hanson, 1996).

The foundation of a "worth ethic" consists in developing a different sense of community within the American public. Park and recreation professionals can contribute in an important and meaningful way to developing this community and helping the public embrace it as its own. The type of community Dustin et al (1995) wish to develop is based on three main tenets: respect as a birthright, freedom to grow, and opportunities for choice. Respect as a birthright entails a shift from "measuring the value of people by their productivity or utility [to measuring their value] by their tenderness, by their compassion, by their degree of humaneness" (p.37). In an atmosphere as such, people would not be compelled to earn other's respect. On the contrary, they could only earn disrespect since respect is a given.

Respect for humans is only one part of respect as a birthright. Park and recreation professional also need to extend respect to include all living things. Non-humans would still have an economic value (i.e., trees for timber), but they would also have a meta-economic value. The grounding for such a claim is that because humans did not create the non-human world, it is presumptuous to think it was created expressly for humans. The non-human world must be viewed as an end-in-itself, as having intrinsic value beyond what it can do for people. This does not negate the economic value of resources for humans, but it adds to it a deeper understanding of our connections and responsibility to that non-human world. Humans might still have "dominion" over the natural world, but with that comes certain obligations and respect.

Freedom to grow is a natural outgrowth of such a respect and sense of obligation. If the natural world and ourselves are intrinsically valuable, it follows that both should be

allowed the freedom to grow. As Dustin et al (1995) point out, the leisure profession already accepts the ideal of freedom of growth toward the human world. Humans have the right to leisure activities as a means for personal and spiritual growth; a "worth ethic" extends this logic to include the non-human world. Given respect as a birthright, leisure is no longer needed to assume status (and thereby respect) in society through conspicuous consumption. Leisure is now freed to become aesthetic, psychological, religious and philosophical contemplation. "Growth, consequently, would also be free to take on new meaning....Growth would refer to the accumulation of knowledge. Its direction would not be outward but inward" (p.38).

The last tenet, opportunities for choice, is perhaps the most important. The first two tenets only have meaning if they can be exercised through opportunities for choice. Park and recreation professionals have an obligation to do everything in their power to ensure continued opportunities for choice. For Dustin et al (1995), "the element of choice is a precious commodity, one that is central to the value of leisure experiences" (p.39). While freedom of choice is important, it is a freedom to exercise choice within the framework of respect as a birthright and opportunities for growth, both of which need to include the non-human world. Choice now becomes tempered with obligation, not an obligation imposed externally, but one arising internally from a "worth ethic" that has become integral to the human psyche.

The responsibility park and recreation professionals have in managing opportunities for choice is three-fold. First, park and recreation professionals have a responsibility to increase the amount of choices available. This is based on the philosophy that more

choices are better than fewer. Second, park and recreation professionals have an obligation to intervene in cases of conflict or collisions between and among recreation users, or where that use jeopardises recreation in its whole. Dustin et al (1995) recommend the refinement of indirect and direct means of intervention to address recreationist conflicts. Interventions should be conducted in as inoffensive a manner as possible so as not to impinge upon the quality of the recreation experience. Thirdly, park and recreation professionals have a responsibility to educate the public regrading recreational choices that are in harmony or disharmony with the larger existence of recreation as a whole and the type of society we wish to create. "Ideally, we should educate people in such a way that their recreation will lead to social and environmental awareness, sensitivity, responsibility, and protection, and that they will like it" (Dustin et al, 1995, p. 63). The type of education Dustin et al advocate is based on enhancing the public's capacity to choose, rather than as a strategy for limiting choices.

Minimum impact practices can be an important part of a "worth ethic," but they do not equal it. Education through inoffensive means to help the public make informed choices, while protecting and promoting the expansion of choices, is far more comprehensive than minimum impact guidelines, and marks the importance of Dustin, McAvoy, and Schultz's (1995) work. The notion of a "worth ethic" begins to ask the hard questions of what exactly is meant by the term "environment," why should the environment be treated in a certain way, and what are human's responsibilities to other humans, to themselves, and to the non-human world. Often times the literature on minimum impact takes for granted that answers to questions such as these are simple and

similar for everyone. It is assumed that treading lightly in wilderness is desired because to do otherwise will destroy the wilderness. The "worth ethic" does not assume that destroying wilderness is bad; it explores why it is bad to destroy the environment and what obligations stem from this.

A "worth ethic" is a philosophical system or framework that sets out what good behaviour is or what ought to be in the world. Dustin, McAvoy, and Schultz (1995) are promoting an ethical framework and suggesting that park and recreation professionals adopt it as their own. While a much needed addition to the literature of outdoor recreation, there still is little understanding of what frameworks are being used by outdoor leaders, park and recreation professionals and outdoor educators. If Dustin et al (1995) feel the need to argue for the "worth ethic," it makes sense they feel outdoor recreation/education professionals have not yet adopted it in any systematic fashion. What frameworks are outdoor education/education professionals working with? What are the implication of such frameworks? As this was not their intent, Dustin, McAvoy, and Schultz (1995) leave unanswered these types of questions. As evidenced from the literature in outdoor education and recreation, environmental ethics is an important topic. Ethical frameworks give us grounding for our actions and help us assign value to the world. Adopting a "worth ethic," for example, would lead an individual to see nature as inherently valuable possibly causing him/her to re-think how nature is treated. Dustin et al (1995) argue dire consequences, in the form of the tragedy of the commons, arise when a "worth ethic" is not adopted. As a wide variety of ethical frameworks exist, many of which have not been as clearly stated or examined in the context of outdoor education and

recreation as the "worth ethic" has, one might ask what the consequences of these other frameworks are. Can outdoor recreation professionals claim to really understand how they are ethical if they simply adopt a set of minimum impact policies and do not explore some of the harder questions of why minimum impact is needed (beyond the construction of an ecological necessity)? Likewise, can outdoor educators really understand the implications of some of the frameworks they adopt (i.e., deep ecology) without asking hard question of themselves and the ethical framework they work with?

Environmental Ethics from Philosophy

The second part of the literature review examines ethical theories in philosophy related to the environment. The philosophical literature is quite diverse with many different frameworks, and this review is limited to (1) those ethical frameworks that the outdoor leaders/scholars in the study use to ground their own ethic and (2) those framework(s) that can inform discussions of whichever system the participants use to ground their own ethic. Within the two participant's discourse can be seen elements of the land ethic, deep ecology, and Christian spirituality. These three frameworks form the bulk of the literature review of environmental philosophy.

Rights-based Views

Rights-based environmental ethics can be traced back to Kant's deontologicalism. Deontological theories are sometimes called nonconsequentialist theories, because these theories place less value on the good or evil consequences of action. In other words,

actions are determined to be ethical or not irrespective of what the effects of the decision will be (Regan, 1984; VanDeVeer & Pierce, 1986). Ethical words and actions become those that are in accord with the rights of entities, while unethical words and actions violate someone's (thing's) right. Competing moral claims are adjudicated based on two factors: where one entity falls on the hierarchy of rights and the importance of the claim of each entity. For example, a human would have more rights than tall grass prairie if consciousness was what counted in conferring rights to entities; however, a human's right to extra space might not outweigh the tall grass prairie's right to exist.

Rights are an arbitrary human construct, and there is quite a range of theories. Determining what entities have moral standing and are worthy of moral consideration determines the shape and scope of the circle of rights. Entities that meet certain criteria are all accorded rights, while those beings that do not meet the criteria fall outside the circle of rights. The image of an expanding circle can be used to illustrate some of the differences between various rights theories. Starting with the most exclusive view, which accord rights only to humans based on a criteria of the ability to reason (Dower, 1989; Gillroy, 1992; VanDeVeer, & Peirce, 1986) , rights views expand to include whole species and ecosystems (Callicott, 1989; Leopold, 1949/1989; Rolston III, 1992). Entities that fall within the circle of rights are usually thought to have intrinsic value; that is, they are valuable regardless of what they can do. Entities that fall outside the circle of rights can also have value, but this value is dependent upon what they can do and is called instrumental value. For example, if one of consciousness (Regan, 1986), ability to feel pain (Singer, 1986, 1997), or will to live (Hooker, 1992; Johnson, 1984; Taylor, 1986) is taken

as the criteria for an entity having rights, then a mountain or forest could not be said to have any rights. That mountain or forest can still be valuable if it has recreation potential or economic value, but this is an instrumental value and does not accord inherent rights to that entity. These debates surrounding what counts as a moral patient and deserves moral consideration all have one similarity: the rights and subsequent moral duties are all conferred to individuals.

Meta-individual rights views.

Aldo Leopold is often credited with developing the concept of the land ethic as a base for moral action (Callicott, 1989). The land ethic that Leopold (1949/1989) espouses differs from rights-based views that accord rights to individual entities. Leopold expands the circle of rights to include whole ecosystems, and with this shift comes a shift in the characteristics that determine how rights are assigned. Individualistic rights theories privileged notions of consciousness, sentience, and will to live as the basis for rights (i.e, if an entity could be said to exhibit a will to live, it could also be said to have a right to pursue that life it was striving for.). When Leopold suggested that ecosystems should be protected, he changed the criteria for how rights were assigned. In the land ethic, ecosystems become valuable because of the traits they exemplify, and duties to them are accorded based on these traits. Leopold's land ethic emphasises characteristics he saw in healthy ecosystems[5]. It was in A Sand County Almanac: And Sketches Here and There

[5] Leopold's discourse on "ecosystems" determines the characteristics he used in conferring rights onto what he saw as "healthy" ecosystems. How ecosystems are defined will determine what "healthy" means, and, hence, what traits are seen as "healthy."

that Leopold (1949/1989) layed out the foundations for the land ethic: "A thing is right when it tends to preserve the integrity, stability, and beauty of the biotic community. It is wrong when it tends otherwise" (pp. 224-225). Here Leopold emphasizes the concepts of integrity and organization of communities over individualistic concepts. Of course individuals can exhibit these traits, but, with a holistic view, rights are not restricted to notions of reason, rationality, consciousness, or the will to live, which usually are all atomistic in nature. The land ethic shifts the focus toward the land collectively by privileging notions of organization, complexity, and community and accords the right to protection to the land based on these traits. This has profound effects for the role humans play in the world: "In short, a land ethic changes the role of *Homo sapiens* from conqueror of the land-community to plain member and citizen of it. It implies respect for his [sic] fellow-members, and also respect for the community as such" (Leopold, 1949/1989, p.204). Becoming a member, instead of conqueror, of the biotic community has some similarities with the worth ethic (Dustin, McAvoy, and Schultz, 1995), because both propose to change the way humans value the land. Following a worth ethic, humans would begin to respect the land and give it the freedom to grow, thus becoming more like a member of a biotic community than a conqueror. Certainly humans have a disproportionate power to drastically alter the biotic community, but with both a land ethic and a worth ethic comes an obligation to exercise that power carefully based on an understanding of the interconnections of all things. Humans become a powerful member, not conqueror, of the natural community.

Both the land ethic and the worth ethic value the land intrinsically. For Leopold

(1949/1989), beauty, integrity, and stability are valuable as ends in themselves and deserve respect simply because they are worth it. Dustin, McAvoy and Schultz's (1995) worth ethic also values the environment intrinsically and suggests nature is worthy of respect and care. Simply stated, since humans did not create the world, we should not presume to think that it was created for us; it has meta-economic value. The environment has value above human concerns for both Leopold (1949/1989) and Dustin, McAvoy, and Schultz (1995), marking a distinct shift from other rights based view that confer right exclusively on individual humans.

Another meta-individualistic rights-based view is Callicott's (1989) holistic approach. For Callicott, entities do not have independent or intrinsic value (i.e., based on beauty, integrity, and stability) from which they derive rights, nor are they valued instrumentally for what the can do. Instead humans, as valuers, confer inherent value on entities (including systems), and thus it becomes important to give moral consideration to those entities. Instrumental value only values something for what it can do and is based on a process independent from humans, while inherent value must be conferred by humans. While this is somewhat different from previous rights views, there still must be criteria that systems meet that make them worthy candidates for humans to confer inherent value.

Rolston III (1988, 1992) is another example of an ethical framework used to extend rights past the individual. He distinguished between intrinsic and instrumental value in much the same way as Callicott (1989) does, but argues that while intrinsic and instrumental value might work to justify rights in some cases

> neither of these traditional terms [intrinsic and instrumental] is satisfactory

> at the level of the ecosystem. Though it has value *in* itself, the system does not have any value *for* itself. Though a value producer, it is not a value owner. We are no longer confronting instrumental value, as though the system were of value instrumentally as a fountain of life. Nor is the question one of intrinsic value, as though the system defended some unified form of itself. We have reached something for which we need a third term: *systemic value*. Duties arise in encounter with the system that projects and protects these member components in biotic community (p. 144).

This, for Rolston III, forms the basis for the rights of systems and our subsequent duties to them: systems project and protect the members within them. Ecosystems are organized systems and are selective just as much as an individual. Instead of perpetuating the individual, or perpetuating more of its kind (as with species), the ecosystem makes more kinds. The systemic value the ecosystem has means humans should give moral consideration to the environment in respect of that value.

The basis for valuation in meta-individual rights-based views.

As both of the participants in this study value the natural environment, rights views that move past conferring rights to only humans have played a more important role in this review. There are three different philosophical frameworks that extend moral consideration, through an extension of rights, past the individual to species and ecosystems: (1) Leopold (1949/1989) who uses intrinsic value, (2) Callicott (1989) who uses the concept inherent value, (3) and Rolston III (1998, 1992) who uses systemic value.

From these different types of value, each philosophical framework is able to derive rights for certain entities. Intrinsic value accords moral standing based on traits that are independent of human use. Inherent value, unlike intrinsic value, depends on the human process of conferring value. Humans have to do the valuing, but this value is still based on characteristics beyond human use. Similarly, systemic value does not rest with what a system (like the ecosystem) can do for humans, nor does the system posses some intrinsic value. Rather, ecosystems are value producers, not value owners. The last type of valuation in rights views is instrumental, which values only those things that have some use to humans. Entities are valued because of what they can do. This type of valuation can be extended to include communities (i.e., the value of a forest becomes based on its timber value). Leopold's (1949/1989), Callicott's (1989), and Rolston III's (1988, 1992) theories confer value in slightly different ways and for slightly different reasons; however, all of them are similar in that they move past human and individual centred rights. Depending on what kind of valuation one follows, different entities will be accorded the status of moral patient for different reasons, but running through all of these environmental ethics is the push to extend moral consideration past the narrow bounds of human beings and individual entities.

Christian Environmental Ethics

A Christian environmental ethic has a very different grounding from the rights views so far considered. There has been nothing in any of the rights theories indicating a mystical, magical, transcendental, or supernatural element. In Christian environmental

ethics, these elements become distinctive.

In monotheistic religions like Judeo-Christianity, God provides the supernatural or transcendent grounding for environmental ethics. Duties to God provide the motivation for caring for the environment and are associated with notions of stewardship, custodial roles, or dominion towards the environment (Kaza, 1996; McDaniel, 1990; and Steffen, 1992). Thus, it becomes humans' responsibility to care for creation as it was commanded by God. Love is often associated with this duty (Bratton, 1992; Kaza, 1996; and McDaniel, 1990). It is the responsibility of human beings to love in the manner of God, that is, a love infinite in scope and suffering (partaking in the both the joy and pain in the world) (McDaniel, 1990). This love creates a duty for all humans that is based on a spiritual foundation and manifested in notions of stewardship. Humans have a divine duty to creation to respect it. This duty is closely connected to rights. All of creation has a right to be treated in a certain manner, but not because of characteristics discovered or conferred by humans. Creation's right to treatment is a divine right conferred by God, and this sets up a different kind of grounding for the relationship with nature. Bratton (1988), for example, discusses how monks' relationships with nature were seen as markers for their spiritual progress and thus duties to nature became grounded in spiritual progress, not rights.

Humans' duties toward nature stem from many different passages in the Bible (particularly in Genesis) where God is said to have created humans in His image. Because God loves all of His creation, and humans are akin to God, we have divine duties to love all of Creation in a similar manner. Passages, like the ones in Genesis, also place a responsibility on humans to act as stewards for God's creation. In Genesis God speaks to

humans and says, "Be fruitful and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it; and have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth" (Genesis 1:28). The notion of dominion sanctifies humanity's stewardship of all of Creation. We have a divine obligation to fulfill our duty to God by looking after or tending God's creation. Notions of stewardship also include an obligation to return to God His creation in the condition it was entrusted to us in (McDaniel, 1990).

Deep Ecology

Deep ecology is about a wider identification with nature. At the core, deep ecologists see the need for identification of the self with "the broader, inclusive, cosmological Self that identifies with all of nature" (Curtin, 1994; see also Reitan, 1996). As opposed to Taylor's (1986) rights-based view that suggests people should respect nature because it "is an attitude we believe all moral agents ought to have simply as moral agents, regardless of whether or not they also love nature" (Taylor, 1986, p. 172), deep ecology is about connecting with and developing feelings for nature. For Devall (1988), "the term *deep ecology* refers to finding our bearings, to the process of grounding ourselves through fuller experience of our connection to earth" (p.11).

Through this connection with nature, humans develop feelings of love and respect, and learn to act and behave in manners that are ecologically friendly. Devall (1988) calls this the ecological self: "As we discover our ecological self we will joyfully defend and interact with that which we identify . . . we will naturally respect, love, honor and protect

that which is our self" (p. 43). Beringer (1997) calls this process the re-animation of the world soul. It is not the same respect born from the disinterested principle that Taylor (1986) wishes humans would adopt. It is a respect that comes from seeing the whole environment as part of your self: "If a person can sincerely say after careful self-evaluation and prayer that 'this earth is part of my body,' then that person would work naturally for global disarmament" (Devall, 1988, p. 46).

Part of the recognition that all things are one is the recognition that all things are interconnected. As Mathews (1988) says, "If the interconnected elements are seen as constituting a greater whole, then each element . . . is conditioned by the whole. The elements are given simultaneously with the whole" (p. 349). Mathews (1988) clarifies this by adding that the individual elements do not lose their distinctiveness; "their functional utility confers on them an essential ontological distinctness and integrity, but this individuality is strictly relative [to the function of the whole]" (p. 350).

Deep ecology consists of eight platform statements (Devall, 1988; Devall & Sessions, 1985; Zimmerman, 1994), which, paraphrased, are: 1) the well-being and flourishing of all life has value independent of its use for humans, 2) richness and diversity in these life forms contribute to their value, and are also values in themselves, 3) except for vital needs, humans have no right to reduce this diversity, 4) reducing the human population will help human life flourish and is essential for non-human life to flourish, 5) there is too much interfering with non-human life by humans already, 6) policies must change to reflect these revelations, 7) an ideological change is needed toward appreciating life quality not adherence to an ever increasingly higher standard of living, and 8) those

who accept the preceding have an obligation to act to bring about the necessary changes. It is through the development of an ecological self that humans can come to see the interconnection of nature, value this interconnection and diversity, and foster the desire to work to prevent the destruction of the environment.

It should be noted that the term "life" in these platform statements is taken to include not only animals, but also rivers, mountains, dirt, whole ecosystems; everything that exists is part of the richness and diversity that deep ecologists feel have value. The ecological self must come to see the interconnections and equality of all these elements in order to be fully expanded.

Although deep ecology has been presented here as if it were a single movement or school of thought, there is actually a fair amount of diversity within it. Arne Naess (1990), for one, has supported the idea of many different philosophies within deep ecology (see also Devall, 1988 and Zimmerman, 1994). Deep ecology is more a way of thinking than ultimate philosophical premisses that everyone must adhere to in order to be a deep ecologist. That the environment is part of one's self and all elements of nature are interconnected and equal in worth differentiates deep ecology from other environmental philosophies, however, how these terms gets operationalized may be different from deep ecologist to deep ecologist.

A Critical Postmodern Perspective

Both outdoor recreation/education and environmental philosophy construct discourses that draw boundaries around what it means to be human, what wilderness is,

where culture stops and nature begins, and what constitutes the non-human realm (to name but a few boundaries). As van Wyck (1997) points out,

> the construction of boundaries–because arbitrary and motivated, and thus both ethical and irreducibly political–implies a responsibility. Boundary-making is a political act. In the absence of stable, eternal and transcendental authorizations for the human/animal distinction, the boundaries 'we' make can be the result of active and affirmative human engagement in the very act of boundary-making (p.108).

"Can be the result of active and affirmative human engagement", but not necessarily so. In the literature of outdoor recreation/education, there has not been much of an attempt to excavate the ways in which power is deployed to construct boundaries (i.e., what motivates such constructions and what the consequences of such constructions are). And if boundary-making is an arbitrary political and ethical process that is not necessarily affirmative, we, as outdoor leaders, scholars, and professionals, can examine this process through adopting a critical postmodern perspective. A critical postmodern perspective recognizes the discursive nature of reality and asks questions designed to examine the effects of power in discourse, which will help the outdoor recreation and education field move toward more ethical action.

Discursive fields have impacts that move off the page, go beyond "text" narrowly defined and enter into our physical, social, economic, and political lives. This, indeed, is the power of the discursive. To reconfigure a popular saying: It is not that names can never hurt me but that names create the sticks and stones that do hurt. The power of

discursive fields is purely discursive, which in no way negates the real elements of its deployment. In fact, this accentuates those elements. If discursive fields have no direct ties to any particular referent (Reality), if they becomes allegorical, then it becomes the ability to inscribe upon the body and mark various structures, definitions, conceptions, limitations, and behaviours that is power. A discursive field is not powerful because it is True, but because its effects have real implications and these implications are more or less pervasive and taken for granted, beneath visibility, operating at a level to structure our very imagining of the world around us. "Rather than saying that 'there is no real,' that there exists no physical world that calls into question 'symbolic' forms that are unable to account for it, we can acknowledge that human speech [indeed all forms of discourse] constructs or composes the world, and gives meaning to a real that has no essence outside of various discursive forms" (Conley, 1997, p. 31).

How we position subjects and objects and how we draw boundaries is an ethical and political endeavour not only because there are no fixed, eternal, and transcendental narratives, but also because what we think about things, how we define things, has results that reach out beyond our theorizing. To be ethical, then, requires attention to the implications and consequences of the discourse one creates and the discursive field(s) one participates in.

The Cyborg Image

One theory that begins to examine the ways nature, humans, good, bad, physical and non-physical have been constructed is Haraway's (1991) image of the cyborg. The

image of the cyborg is one of difference, of boundary transgressions–it is part machine, part human; part real, part fantasy; natural, yet artificial.

Haraway (1991) sees Western society as based upon a mythic quest for unity and wholes. For example, the category "woman" is often taken to be singular–the diversity within it reduced to a homogeneity of form without much relief. Another mythic whole in Western culture is that of nature. Nature is seen as pure, innocent, and those beings that are one with nature are likewise pure and innocent–the biblical Garden of Eden. Those that are one with nature (organic wholes) can remain in the Garden and hence in the grace of God. For Haraway, "the cyborg skips the step of original unity, of identification with nature in the Western sense" (p.151). The cyborg does not dream of salvation through a restoration of the Garden. It does not long for unity with mythic wholes like a heterosexual mate, an organic family, or a finished whole such as a city or the cosmos. Haraway suggests that by questioning and subverting mythic wholes "the certainty of what counts as nature–a source of insight and promise of innocence–is undermined, probably fatally. The transcendent authorization of interpretation is lost and with it the ontology grounding 'Western' epistemology" (p.152). Without an ontological grounding in organic wholes, the image of the cyborg begins to blur certain boundaries. When nature is taken as a whole, as complete, as opposed to that which is artificial, there is little question of what it really is. However, when the concept of nature is more closely examined, the certainty by which we know it is challenged. For example, is a National Park natural? Can it be natural if it is managed? If no fires are allowed to burn, does this make it natural? Yet on the other hand, it can hardly be said to be unnatural or artificial.

The division of parks and wilderness into either completely natural or completely unnatural is the quest for organic wholes, which the image of the cyborg brings into question. By blurring three main distinctions, the cyborg image makes it unclear exactly what is meant by natural and unnatural in relation to parks and managed land.

The first boundary that becomes blurred by the cyborg myth is that of human-animal. Where once we "knew" what the distinction was between ourselves and animals, when we think about a cyborg, the boundary becomes much more muddied or leaky. The ontological grounding for animals as opposed to humans gives way the more clearly one tries to maintain this distinction. What exactly does constitute a human as distinct from animals? Is it sentience? Is it language? Or perhaps self-consciousness? Not only have developments in science come to question whether humans are the only creature to display many of these traits, the cyborg questions our ability to know ourselves in any definitive and commanding fashion. Are we self-conscious and what counts for self-consciousness in the first place? The cyborg is composed of

> ourselves and other organic creatures in our unchosen 'high-technological' guise as information systems, texts, and ergonomically controlled labouring, desiring, and reproducing systems. The second essential ingredient in cyborgs is machines in their guise, also, as communication systems, texts, and self-acting, ergonomically designed apparatuses (Haraway 1991, p. 1).

The unchosen aspects of cyborg questions our ability to know ourselves as if we were some transparent, uni-dimensional entity, while the self-acting machine crosses the

boundary into what humans alone are supposed to be. The cyborg is not an animal, yet is not fully a human. Indeed, the very categories "human" and "animal" become less meaningful and the dividing line between them blurs and shifts.

This combination of machine and human destabilizes the second boundary for Haraway (1991)–that of machine and organism. Early machines always had the possibility of being haunted by a spectre: a ghost in the machine. They could be described as mimicking human characteristics, of even being animated by a soul, but they themselves did not have one. Now we are not so sure where human ends and machine begins. Our bodies have become so inscribed by the politics of technology that our very self-image is the embodiment of cyborg entities. It is impossible for most of us to conceive ourselves in innocent fashions any longer. Technologies have removed pieces of our body; we incorporate technology into our daily lives (glasses, fillings, various sorts of body adornments); we create images of ourselves and transmit these through cybernetic space. Our self image is bound up in and inscribed by technology to such a degree that to remove it means removing aspects of ourselves. Who would we be without the level of technology we have today becomes an interesting question.

The third boundary Haraway (1991) disrupts is that between physical and non-physical. Underpinning the whole ontological challenge that cyborgs present is a challenge to what material reality is. Technology has reached a point now where physicality is non-essential. The internet and cyberspace are examples of "things" that are not really "things" in a material sense, yet still exist. What is known to be physical and Real becomes contested with the cyborg. Poet/singer Leonard Cohen states it well (in a disk ironically

titled "The Future") by saying; "It's coming through a hole in the air,/from those nights in Tiananmen Square./It's coming from the feel/ that it ain't exactly real,/or it's real but it ain't exactly there."

As technology infuses outdoor recreation and education more and more, outdoor professionals begin to encounter this non-materiality of technology. Global Positioning Systems (GPS) are one example of the blurred distinctions between what is Real (physical) and what is not. Outdoor leaders today have the capability of knowing their exact position (within a few metres), no matter where in the wilderness they are. Based upon satellite scanning ability, GPS can pinpoint the location of an individual and even retrace his/her steps back out of the wilderness. There is a grid overlaid upon the entire planet that is as inescapable as it is immaterial. The grid can neither be touched nor seen, yet its impacts on the feelings (and even actuality) of remoteness in wilderness excursions can hardly be understated.

The cyborg image fractures identities and categories in destabilizing these three boundaries. No longer are "nature," "natural," "human," "culture," "good," "bad," "right," "wrong" (among others) transparent categories; they are contested and heterogenous. For Haraway (1991) "the dichotomies of mind and body, animal and human, organism and machine, public and private, nature and culture, men and women, primitive and civilized are all in question ideologically" (p. 163). Attention to the real and physical effects of boundary-making and transgressions form "an argument for pleasure in the confusion of boundaries and for responsibility in their construction" (p. 150). Cyborgs make possible re-combinations of these boundaries in nearly infinite, polymorphous, ludic

ways that have profound effects on various people–effects that vary from person to person and place to place, yet are essential "for people who need and hope to live in a world less riddled by the dominations of race, colonialism, class, gender, and sexuality" (p. 2). These re-combinations are filled with both potential and danger: "Hope, because no order is stable or legitimate. Any order can be challenged and will change. Caution, because bifurcations may bring about unexpected and disastrous catastrophe" (Conley, 1997, p.73). Chapter Five will bring some of these possible ludic re-combinations of discursive potentials to the field of outdoor recréation and education through the discourse of the two participants.

Ordered Evil and Trespasses

This notion of hope and caution, of unexpected catastrophe, has been captured by Orlie (1997), and can be used to examine some of the effects, consequences, or trespasses of the discursive field of outdoor education and recreation. For Orlie (1997),

> harm and unfairness are inevitable and ubiquitous in human living, but contemporary power relations have transposed the 'problem of evil'. Although malevolent and malicious crime remain, 'ordinary' evil is preponderant and more pressing in present contexts. Ordinary evil is the product of trespass, not sin; of thoughtlessness, not wickedness. Prevalent notions of ethical conduct–performing contracts, being reasonable, behaving predictably–do not necessarily diminish ordinary evil, but in fact often reinforce and extend it (p. 11).

This type of harm (trespass) differs from more obvious forms of evil where the perpetrator not only knows what harm has been done, but often sets out to cause it specifically. Trespasses occur "under circumstances where we did not or could not have known what we were doing" (p. 21). Furthermore, trespasses are inevitable in all human action. As we set out to make our way in the world we, of necessity, close off other people's ways of making themselves; "we trespass against others when we pursue a living and create a home" (p. 21).

While trespasses are in many ways unknown and unknowable, that is not to say they are without pattern. Because trespasses arise from well intentioned, well behaved, responsible people who act in accord with the social order, it is the pattern of social order that is replicated in trespasses; "good and harm are done simultaneously and in ways that perpetuate power relations..." (Orlie, 1997, p.3). Similar to Hutcheon's (1989) "complicitous critique," we are implicated in power structures and relations we can neither escape nor avoid. We are complicit even in our critique, because we often use hegemonic power structures to make the critique, or we benefit from the very things we are opposed to. For instance, many outdoor leaders may be opposed to war, yet the very technology that made Global Positioning System (GPS) devices possible is the same satellite technology used in much of modern warfare. The use of GPS devices on outdoor trips does not cause modern warfare, yet both are supported by the same technology and are not totally unconnected. The discursive field of outdoor recreation is connected, through its use of the GPS technology, to harmful consequences, while at the same time benefitting from that technology.

> How might we recognize and respond to the past and present, collective and individual, harms and wounds that suffuse our relations with one another? If harm and injustices are to some degree an unavoidable effect of human living, how should we acknowledge these grievances? What does it mean to live responsibly and freely in such contexts? (Orlie, 1997, p. 169).

These difficult questions about power and responsibility are among those we outdoor professionals need to ask ourselves if we wish to start examining our ethics.

Deep Ecology and the Will to Totality

One of the main themes in deep ecology is that of Self-realization–the expansion of human's self-identity to include all of nature. Deep ecologists urge humans to see themselves as part of nature and to start recognizing these connections. Without this recognition, deep ecologists argue, nature will continue to be used and abused for our ends, because it is not fundamentally a part of ourselves.

Self-realization, as a discursive performance, moves the theoretical gaze to the outside (van Wyck, 1997). When the world is viewed as an interconnected whole, we need to situate our viewpoint outside the planet–the earth is visible only from space. A move that shifts the gaze to the outside also reduces the differences on the inside. If everything is interconnected and part of a whole, difference between the parts becomes less important than the similarity that binds all together. Everything becomes one. In deep ecology, selves merge into one larger Ecological Self. Part of the diversity that gets

reduced is the divisions between what is human and what is nature. Self-realization is the recognition of humanity's connections with, similarities to, and oneness with nature. Distinctions and divisions which threaten this organic whole are shunted aside in favour of unity.

Motivating this move to the outside is a will to totality (van Wyck, 1997). The will to totality is the tendency to universalize at the expense of the particular, to make theory that accounts for everything, and to ground such theorizing in unassailable Truth claims. One example of a Truth claim that deep ecologists turn to is ecological fact. Zimmerman (1994) has read the idea of Self-realization as resting upon a type of ontological phenomenalism (the belief that phenomena have some kind of ontological status beyond our cognition about and perception of them). That all in nature is interconnected is an ecological Truth claim, based on ontological phenomenalism, that deep ecologists are reluctant to see as discursive because that "would presumably undermine the authority of such claims, thereby weakening deep ecology's presumption that its views are based on 'scientific truth'" (Zimmerman, 1994, p.101). The will to totality takes ecology's Truth claims, statements about what is, and adds to it to a moral "ought". Ecology's claim that things in nature are interconnected in and of itself does not prescribe any moral tenets, but deep ecology, motivated by a will to totality, changes this statement into a Truth claim with attendant moral prescriptions. In effect, deep ecology adds that it is good to recognize that things are interconnected and to act in ways commensurate with this recognition. Humanity should see its interconnections with nature and act to maintain the integrity of the planet. Here is the will to totality–**all** humanity should act according to the

prescriptions of deep ecology. Deep ecological claims, such as the previous statements, derive their moral strength from ontological phenomenalism and are motivated through the will to totality.

By tying the notion of Self-realization to ecological Truths about nature, deep ecology creates a narrative that distinguishes between Truth and Falsity (Zimmerman, 1994). Nature becomes something that is Real, that has an ontological status unaffected by our knowledge of it. Furthermore, it is the science of ecology that reveals the Truth of what nature Really is. Other definitions end up charitably labelled as story, fable, or myth, or uncharitably as wrong, misinformed, or incorrect. There is a certain amount of security in dualistic notions of the world, especially a dualistic split between Truth and Falsity. As long as deep ecology remains at the Truth end of this dualism, it is unassailable. Arguments against Self-realization and deep ecology have first to contend with the power of ecological science to show nature's True form.

The will to totality and ontological phenomenalism, which result in a move to the outside that establishes an objective, distanced gaze based on the science of ecology, produces accounts of nature that deny the authorship of the human subject (van Wyck, 1997). When humans are seen as part of nature, as one with nature, passages like this arise:

> If a person can sincerely say after careful self-evaluation and prayer that "this earth is part of my body," then that person would naturally work for global disarmament and preservation of the atmosphere of the earth. If a person can sincerely say, "If this place is destroyed then

> something in me is destroyed," then that person has an intense feeling of belonging to the place (Devall, 1988, p.46).

Not only is the totalizing aspect present (people working "naturally" for global disarmament is a moral prescription about what is good and right in life for everyone), but so, too, is a type of ventriloquism. When humans become nature, we authorize ourselves as agents able to speak for nature (which has become ourself). We know what is best for nature, because we are nature. If something in me is destroyed when nature is destroyed, I have an obligation, a right, and a need to speak out about this. Nature now becomes something in need of representation, it becomes an object we can and should speak for. The difference between the ventriloquist nature of deep ecology and other environmentalisms that speak about nature is that deep ecology denies, masks, or covers up the operation of speaking for nature with a discourse that erases the human subject as distinct from nature. When deep ecology makes the human subject one with nature, it masks the ability it gives humans to speak for nature–nature is seen as speaking for itself through the human. Instead of seeking to be a scientist who speaks for nature in a privileged sphere (as in ecology), the deep ecologist seeks to become nature speaking for itself. The process of embodying an Ecological Self, which leads to this ventriloquism, can be chronicled through the following series of identifications: "'I am protecting the rainforest' develops to 'I am part of the rainforest protecting myself. I am that part of the rainforest recently emerged into thinking" (Seed quoted in Devall and Sessions, 1985, p. 243).

Summary

This chapter first outlined the discursive field of outdoor education and recreation. Outdoor education's emphasis on environmental ethics focussed mainly on developing a personal connection with nature. This literature suggested many different ways to develop this connection and many different groundings for that connection. For example, some outdoor educators suggest an ecological based approach to expose people to the wonder of nature, while others turn to a more spiritual or cultural approach (i.e., the Rediscovery programme). Curriculum-based outdoor educators also emphasize connecting to the natural world, but they do so through a more formal educational process with more didactic elements. Outdoor recreation focuses on environmental ethics largely in the form of minimum impact. Research in this area attempts to study ecosystems (or elements in ecosystems) to better understand the impact that human users have on them and then suggest methods to decrease unwanted or excessive impacts. Although minimum impact is overwhelmingly focussed on in the literature, there are other elements. Dustin, McAvoy, and Schultz (1995) have proposed a "worth ethic" for outdoor professionals. These authors suggest that developing an ethic based on respect as a birth-right, the freedom to grow, and the freedom to choose is needed to protect not only wilderness, but also humans. The worth ethic goes beyond minimum impact studies to the extent that it explores the grounding for why the environment is worth protecting, and how to do so while still recognizing human rights and needs.

The second section of the literature review highlighted certain forms of environmental ethics found in the literature that related to the discourse of the two

participants in the study. Broadly defined, this literature has been broken down into three sections: (a) rights-based views, (b) spiritual or religious views, and (c) deep ecology views. Rights-based views were divided into individualistic and meta-individualistic theories. The discourse of the two participants emphasizes the natural community, which makes meta-individualistic theories of rights more germane. These theories expand the circle of rights beyond a single entity and focus on communities and species, conferring rights to those things that can be said to be a system. There were three groundings for the valuation of rights views: intrinsic, inherent, and instrumental value. The land ethic of Leopold (1949/1989) used intrinsic value predominantly, and as we shall see, this connects well with the outdoor recreation's emphasis on minimum impact.

Spiritual groundings for environmental ethics were restricted to Christian ethics. This ethic is grounded on notions of stewardship and divine duties to Creation. Humans are seen as having certain obligations to love and treat nature as a reflection of God. We are to take care of it, act as shepards or stewards of the environment as God commanded. This view differs from rights views because rights stem from rational criteria that humans discern, whereas, Christian ethics are grounded in transcendental forces and concepts.

Lastly, deep ecology was explored. Deep ecology encourages humans to begin to identify with all of nature. Humans need to develop an Ecological Self. If we learn to see ourselves as inherently part of the earth, and it part of us, we will stop our destructive actions and behaviours toward it (now ourselves). Deep ecology presents itself as a non-dualistic framework that attempts to re-unite the human self with all of the earth.

No classification system captures everything, and this one is no exception. There

are many theories that combine and cross over the categories of this system. For example, it is not entirely incompatible to think that a deep ecologist could also believe in God and notions of stewardship toward the environment. As well, the difference between land ethic and deep ecology is not always a clear line. For example, Devall (1988) calls Callicott a deep ecological thinker, while Callicott (1989) seems to distance himself from deep ecologists, calling them "the self-styled Deep Ecologists" (p. 4). These categories are fluid and blurred at the edges and some allowance for this must be made.

Thirdly, this chapter covered some of the critical postmodernist writings relevant to environmental ethics. The purpose here was to illustrate the ways in which discourse manoeuvres, positions, and creates subjects (both human and non-human). The ways environmental ethical frameworks deploy power to create a reality that has a discursive force to it can also be applied to the discursive field of outdoor education and recreation as seen through the discourse of two leaders/scholars. This project will comprise Chapter Five in which I will endeavour to excavate how the discourse of two outdoor leaders/scholars serves to prop up constructions of human beings, nature, wilderness, technology, as well as notions of good, bad, and better. This propping up defines, confines, and collapses the poles of human/non-human, nature/non-nature, subject/object and in this sense has some serious "real" effects on the world.

Chapter Three:
Methodology

Interpretive Research

This study uses an interpretive approach that deals with discursive fields and meaning: "That is, particular actors, in particular places, at particular times, fashion meaning out of events and phenomena through prolonged, complex processes of social interaction involving history, language, and action" (Schwandt, 1994, p.118). The production of meaning involves both meta-human forces and individual agency; it is a creative process, and although embedded within history and language (discursive fields), humans have some agency within this process. For Denzin (1989), "meaning is always triadic, involving interaction between a person, an object, and action taken toward the object; meaning is interactional, interpretive, open-ended, often ambiguous, inconclusive, and conflictual" (p. 143). Meaning is rarely, if ever, transparent. Meaning's open-ended nature, its ambiguity and inconclusiveness, suggests a need for interpretation. Interpretation, in this sense, is the process by which a meaning is located in a segment of discourse and a particular discursive field. The number, kind, and consequences of meanings locatable to any given discourse are not, of necessity, limited to those intended by the author or actor. As Orlie (1997) points out, our actions and ways of making it in the world have consequences and results we can never foresee, nor foreclose, which often stem from unintended meanings.

This thesis explores the discourse that was produced by two outdoor leaders/scholars on an outdoor trip, in their writing, and during an interview. The intention

of this analysis was to explore the effects of how the larger level discursive field of outdoor education and recreation deploys power as reflected in an individual's discourse. An interpretive approach was chosen as the methodology, because the first step in this process is an attempt to understand the meaning(s) of the discourse the two participants produced. It is the emphasis on the effects of power that distinguishes this project as critical interpretation. The analysis proceeds from an understanding of the meanings the two participants intended to an examination of some of the consequences of how power is mobilized in a discursive field. These consequences can be unknown and unintended in the author's discourse, yet nonetheless exist as results of the discursive field(s) the two participants align themselves with.

Critical Interpretation

Kvale (1996) uses seven canons to explain interpretive research in general. Of these seven general canons, some are particularly pertinent to a critical interpretive stance. The first canon is that of a back and forth process between the parts and the whole that relates the parts of a discourse to larger discursive levels. How does a particular theme relate overall to the discourse that the individual produced, and how does the discourse the individual is engaged in connect to other discourses produced by society? Discourse is not created in a vacuum, and so investigation of how any particular theme that arises in one discourse connects to larger discursive forces is possible. Critically reading text in this way requires the reader to see both the author's intended point and be "capable of moving outside the text and viewing it from several different perspectives with an eye to seeing it

more completely" (Steele, 1989, p.224, see also Tesch, 1990, p.94). These larger discursive forces, which exist outside, surround, underlie, and infuse individual text and themes, can in turn be analysed in light of a deeper understanding of the themes arising within, which in turn effects the understandings of the larger meaning. By relating themes to larger social interests and forces, critical interpretation "can be used to help individuals or agencies become aware of controlling features underlying their activities" (Rothe, 1993, p. 61).

The second canon of interpretive research is a striving to reach a "good Gestalt", or an inner unity of the text free of logical contradictions. The researcher attempts an interpretation that does not do violence to the text. Unity within the text does not necessarily reduce difference. Unity implies a certain coherence of interpretation; the different elements of the text have been interpreted, but not forced into relationships. Coherence, in some cases, might mean that the unrelatable sections be left unrelated. Discourses are very complex and hardly linear in their development, so it should not be surprising that some elements are not resolvable into others. This difference needs to be highlighted, brought to the surface and maintained, not explained away. There are often tensions as people seek to navigate through various, and sometimes competing, discursive fields, and the construction of meaning is ambiguous, conflicting, and inconclusive. A good Gestalt of text will embrace these tensions and paradoxes, not omit or resolve them.

Thirdly, interpretive research requires extensive knowledge about the themes in the text so that the researcher may be sensitive to the nuances of meanings expressed. Fourth, the researcher cannot jump outside of the tradition that he or she comes form. Instead, the

position from which interpretation is engaged in should be elucidated, and this itself can in turn be interpreted. Lastly, "every interpretation involves innovation and creativity...interpretation goes beyond the immediately given and enriches the understanding by bringing forth new differences and interrelations in the text" (Kvale, 1996, p. 50). It is in this last canon that some of the larger levels discursive effects and unintended meanings can be explored which make this project a critical form of interpretation.

My interpretation of the discourse of the two leaders/scholars in this study will begin at a descriptive level (the first reading). Here I employ some of Kvale's (1996) interpretive canons in an attempt to arrive at a "good Gestalt" of both participant's text. By moving back and forth between the parts of their discourses and larger wholes (both of their discourse and other discursive fields exerting influence on them), I will paint a picture of the major themes of the discourse both participants produce on environmental ethics. From this vantage point, it is possible to begin inquiry into how power is deployed in the leaders'/scholars' discourse. A focus on power's effects through discourse distinguishes this thesis as critical interpretation.

Critical interpretation often sees meaning as "unstable, never fixed, never determined or determinate" (Schwandt, 1997, p.122). Critical interpretation assumes that reality does not relate isomorphically to concepts within the mind of the perceiver. Rather, images and concepts relate together in an endless play of meaning, which frees discourse from notions of ontological determinism. Reality, while out there, is not captured by our discourse in an absolute manner. Instead, discourse creates a conventional level of reality

that has real effects, but is not in itself Reality. These conventional representations give meaning and value within certain discursive fields, and as such are political and tied to power. Without an absolute ontological grounding, discourse is freed from the confines of a single one to one relationship with the truth and now becomes attempts at positioning and re-positioning oneself and others in relation to created truths.

Hey (1998), in a study of the discourse produced by school girls, illustrates the power and effects that discourse can have in a manner similar to my use of critical interpretation. As the girls in Hey's study spoke about and to each other, they created relationships and discourses that "can and do try to position and out-position each other through their access to differential resources of social, economic and cultural power" (p.3). This positioning and out-positioning had real effects. It was more than simply how the girls thought about each other. When one was out-positioned she became an outcast from the group, lost (at least temporarily) her social supports and friends. Hey (1998) found that the different girls mobilized their power based on differential access to various forms of cultural capital, that is, markers that could be created and/or emphasized that would position its owner in a place of desirability against which other girls would be measured. By tying into these larger forms of cultural capital, the girls in Hey's study were engaging in powerful discursive fields that were larger than themselves. As Hey suggests, there is a need "for a language that captures girls making themselves 'but not necessarily in conditions of their own choosing'" (p.12). The discourses that the girls engage in influence how they mobilize cultural capital, gain access to power, and because they are not of their making, confine their movements.

As the girls manipulate discourse and produce themselves and other girls around them, they play with and manoeuver boundaries between normal/abnormal, appropriate/inappropriate, good/bad, male/female, masculine/feminine, and others. These borders

> signify an expressive space (that is simultaneously public and personal) around the edges of the boundaried public space of schooling....Borderlands are one of the places in schooling where affinities are coerced or refused–where allegiances are traded and identifications secured within/against the hegemonics of power. Here normality is extracted by girls from each other. It is not that girls cannot resist these injunctions, rather more that few were prepared to pay the socio-economic costs of deviating from the correct 'difference' that was being insisted upon (p.12).

In, around, and across these borders, the girls enforced conceptions of each other onto one another and attempted resistance of such definitions. Whenever one lost out in this contest, the results were often harsh (i.e., loss of friends, loss of status, denial of self respect).

Hey's (1998) study is an examination of discourse's ability to create legitimation of certain views of what a good girl is, and then to extend that definition onto others. Hey uses a critical interpretive approach to explore some of ways the school girls attempt this legitimation through discursive employments of cultural capital (power) and the effects of that deployment. The discourse that the participants in my study employ can also be read as exercising various forms of cultural capital in attempts to extend the legitimation of

certain constructions of the world onto others. Like Hey's (1998) study, the discursive effects of the discourse of the two leaders/scholars in the thesis have real effects. How the various boundaries are constructed and how information rate and flow across these boundaries is controlled begin to determine what is good in the world, what is right, and what is acceptable behaviour. For example, if the environment is seen as something pristine and valuable because of this pristine state, certain behaviours such as minimum impact practices and recycling will be encouraged while others such as industrial development will be harder to justify and support. Hey's (1998) study explores how power was embedded in various discursive utterances of school girls. This thesis examines various facets of the discourse produced by two outdoor leaders/scholars to show how individual discourse can be connected to power at the larger discursive field level.

The discourse of the outdoor leaders/scholars in my study are engaged in also positions the human subject and creates boundaries around humans, nature, good, and bad. Both participants' discourse can be read as a re-positioning of certain boundaries in an attempt to extend a particular type of legitimation onto the world. Following Hanson (1996), I will examine how nature, humans, culture, technology, and notions of good and bad are constructed, contested, positioned, and some of the political and real effects of this. Hanson asks: "What counts as nature? Who determines what nature is? What form of nature and body politic is established or authorized on the one hand, and excluded on the other, by specific appropriations or constructions of knowledge? Finally, how are power and science intertwined in these constructions of nature?" (p.3) In this light, the discourse of the outdoor leaders/scholars on environmental ethics can be seen as attempts, in ways

similar to Hey's (1998) school girls, to convince others (and oneself) of certain constructed realities (although these realities may be perceived by some as having direct access to the referents–i.e., as the truth). A critical interpretive approach seeks to understand how this legitimation is enacted and what some of the effects of it might be.

It is through discourse, then, that truth is constructed, contested, and maintained. Power becomes the ability to fix the ways in which this is done. As Clegg (1989) says, "to the extent that meanings become fixed or reified in certain forms, which then articulate particular practices, agents and relations, this fixity is power" (p. 183). Discursive manoeuvres that establish a fixity of meaning have extended legitimation to a large extent by convincing others that that discourse accurately portrays the world as it Really is. There is an assumed connection between the symbols used in a discursive field and the things that those symbols refer to. Discourses that can claim such a connection become privileged and can exercise greater power to fix meaning in wider circles. Because truth is constructed, this thesis will focus on "how certain forms of representation are constituted rather than upon the 'truth' or 'falsity' of the representation themselves" (Clegg, p. 158). Because discourse (and power) is a creative process, we can ask: Whose interests does a particular discourse serve? Who/what is privileged by a certain construction of truth? What assumptions need to be accepted before this particular construction can be adopted? Rothe (1993) adds to this list: "What knowledge is selected/neglected? Who has the power to control the knowledge selection?....To what extent do people act as prescribed or as they wish?.... [and] How is a situation physically and socially structured to reflect certain interests?" (p.61).

This type of critical interpretation assumes that people's actions are based on fundamental views, ideologies, value stances, and interests: "These basic and possibly hidden perspectives undergird our thinking and acting. Critical analysis asks questions which probe, uncover, and make explicit such foundations" (Rothe, 1993, p.59).

The view that meanings are open-ended, ambiguous, and constructed leads me to agree with St. Pierre (1997) in "preferring thought inspired by disjunction, difference, deindividualization, multiplication, displacement, disunity, mobile arrangements, and so forth over unitary, totalizing, sedentary, and systematic thought" (p.408). This emphasis on disjunction and disunity provides direction for the investigation of the discourse of the two leaders/scholars. The meanings I seek to uncover are those that stand apart, that offer differing explanations for the world, and contest previously given meanings. These are powerful sites of resistance. By putting forth meanings that are not totalizing, Bob and Leo attempt a discursive manoeuver that re-presents the world (or part of it) in a new light. For example, rather than focus on one explanation for what is valuable about nature, I move instead to look at multiple explanations and do not try to resolve these differences. How Bob and Leo construct the world around them often has this resistive element. As an example, Leo teaches a wilderness course in which he is one hundred percent in favour of wilderness areas, regardless of the costs and outcomes. He feels the students are inundated with other stories about the management value of land or about the resource value of the land in the rest of their lives and courses. For Leo, this course becomes a form of resistence and of re-presenting the world to students. This thesis emphasizes streams and currents, similar to this example, within Bob's and Leo's discourse that

demonstrate a resistive character. On the other hand, there are instances where both participants engage in discourse that perpetuates social power structures and has unwanted and unknown effects and consequences. For example, Leo sometimes employs a dualistic division of the world into wilderness and urban. This dualism has some effects and consequences that he may not be aware of and probably would not support overtly. The privileging of discontinuity and discordance, as St. Pierre (1997) does, influences the direction of analysis by shifting the focus to where Bob's or Leo's discourse is different, where it is inconsistent, where it supports rather than challenges given notions and power structures, as well as where it resists.

Method

Some of the literature on outdoor education and recreation reveals an overt commitment to environmental ethics and so one would expect that individuals involved in outdoor activities in an educational role would have developed (or are developing) a sense of an environmental ethic. The two leaders/scholars selected for this study teach outdoor courses with an emphasis on the educational value of the environment and lead trips in the outdoors that focus on outdoor education and environmental ethics. The first participant, Leo McAvoy, has been teaching and leading out of the University of Minnesota for 25 years, and through the supervision of numerous graduate students, has had the opportunity to affect a number of future practitioners in the field. Bob Henderson, the second participant, has been leading trips for 18 years from McMaster University and as the editor of Pathways: The Ontario Journal of Outdoor Education, also has had a

significant influence in the field. In addition, both participants write on the importance and value of nature and wilderness, thus contributing to the evolution of the field through the development and promotion of theory and ideas. Both of these individuals are currently leading trips with students as part of university courses, which allows for an exploration of how they perform their ethics in action as well as written discourse. These activities and accomplishments make both leaders/scholars logical choices for this research in part because of the richness of their discourse, but also because they have been positioned by the field as leaders, experts, and influential.

To analyse both the individual discourse of the two outdoor leaders/scholars and the relevant discursive fields, I have structured the research to include written, oral, and behavioural data. The collection of the data included a review of the literature both participants had written, which helped in the formation of questions used to gather the oral data. The oral data was collected in the form of an open-ended, semi-structured interview done with both Bob and Leo. Questions in this interview ask the individual to reflect on his writing and behaviour and to explain first what he feels to be his environmental ethic and second how he mobilizes his ethic, that is, how does he achieve the goals of his environmental ethic with a group? For instance, if one aspect of the leader/scholar's ethic was creating an awareness of minimum impact techniques, further interview questions ask him to illuminate ways he hoped to achieve this end. Both interviews were conducted in close proximity to the participant-observation portion of the data collection, which enabled a back and forth process between the observation made of each leader/scholar on the out-trips and answers each gave to questions in the interview

(or vice versa). There were occasions for both participants where issues that were raised either in the interview or the trip generated the need for clarification later. This back and forth process allowed for a deeper understanding of the discourse both Bob and Leo produced. Follow-up interviews (by e-mail or phone) were done with each participant to ask questions and follow-up ideas that arose and needed expanding. The last type of data collected was observational data in the form of participant-observation, which was used to address the routine, everyday trip behaviour of the leader/scholar (Jorgensen, 1989) and access some of the behavioural elements of the leader's/scholar's discourse on environmental ethics. Informal discussions on the trip once a day (time permitting) to discuss daily issues that arose were also included as a means to expand on any observations made during the trip.

The collection of all the data was guided by the parameters of the thesis question. For example, the readings selected for analysis were bounded to those that dealt with or connected to environmental ethics or where identified by the participant as important in understanding his environmental ethic. Observation made on the trips were similarly focussed on elements of the participant's environmental ethic. Those behaviours that while necessary for the organization and functioning of the trip but unrelated to how Bob or Leo viewed the environment are not included. All of the oral and observational data were transcribed by the author and coded with the NUDIST qualitative data analysis programme to generate themes and patterns. These themes and patterns were then used as the foundation for the critical application of various lenses to produce the readings of how power is deployed in the discursive field(s) each leader/scholar is connected with.

The data are presented in the thesis beginning first with a description of each of the participants' individual discourse[6]. It is necessary to have an impression of what the ethical discourses of each leader/scholar are before moving to consider how power is deployed. This descriptive section is based upon any pertinent writings of Bob and Leo, other supporting literature that helps to situate their discourse in the field of outdoor education and recreation, observations of their behaviour while on the trip, and the interviews and conversations with each participant. The purpose of the descriptive section is to illustrate some of the beliefs, values, and frameworks of both Bob and Leo. This first reading of the discourse of each outdoor leader/scholar focuses on the author's intended position (similar to Denzin's [1989] terms "capture" and "bracketing").

After the descriptive sections, various readings of the data are presented to arrive at a critical interpretation of the leader's/scholar's discourse. The first of these readings, for the outside perspectives (Denzin's [1989] "construction"), focus on the various frameworks in environmental ethics that fit most closely with the participant's discourse. The next reading focuses on themes and patterns arising from the initial readings and subject those themes and patterns to questions arising from the critical interpretive perspective (i.e., Whose interests are served by this framework? What knowledge is selected, and what neglected? How does this discourse attempt to extend legitimation and what are the effects of this?).

---

[6] The descriptive sections of the leader's/scholar's discourse were returned to him for clarification of confusing elements and confirmation of accuracy on details. All of the factual misunderstandings that were identified by each leader/scholar were resolved.

Conclusion

The research question explores the discourse on environmental ethics used by two leaders/scholars in outdoor recreation/education and how these frameworks are mobilized in discursive fields. A review of the literature of outdoor recreation/education and environmental philosophy indicates the importance and diversity of environmental ethics, as well as suggests the need to investigate which ethics are being used, how, and what the discursive consequences of their use are. There are always effects of the various ways we construct the world and our place in it. The frameworks we use to make decisions about the environment and proper environmental behaviour (which form our environmental ethic) can be analysed to show some of these effects. A critical interpretive approach examines the performance of environmental ethics by asking questions that address how environmental ethical discourses mobilize power through their connections with larger discursive fields (i.e., Whose/what interests do they serve? Who/what gets excluded? Who/what gets included?). The answers to these questions are needed in order to see how it is possible for outdoor leaders/scholars to adopt an ethical discourse that has a myriad of consequences.

To address these issues, this thesis investigates the environmental ethics of two prominent outdoor leaders/scholars. The focus is on how the discursive field of outdoor education and recreation is played out through the individuals. Data includes a review of the written material produced by the participants, semi-structured interviews, and participant-observation during a wilderness trip. Ethics are at least a complex mix of values, systems of thought, epistemological and ontological positions, feelings, emotions,

and power issues. The focus on how the effects of the power of discursive fields is played through an individual's discourse leads to this combination of written, oral, and behavioural data collection methods in order to capture the complex interplay of power and meaning inherent in the ethical discourses of individuals.

There are some limitations inherent in this type of research. For example, it was not possible, due to time constraints, to observe the type of courses each leader/scholar teaches. The type of knowledge created in the classroom relates to the individual discourse produced by each participant, yet this data remain unavailable for analysis. In addition, both leaders are quite complex with a long history of contributions to the field of outdoor education and recreation. This thesis should not be seen as an attempt to capture every aspect of their discourse. It is, instead, an examination of some of the themes and patterns that arose during limited exposure to each participant. Likewise, there are a plethora of effects of power as seen through discursive fields, and all of these cannot possibly be exhausted here. The thesis focuses on certain effects and patterns that arose through an examination of these two particular participants during the window of opportunity provided by this research. Another limitation is that each of the participants is male and teaches in a North American university. The particular demographics of each leader/scholar excludes an examination of various cultural or gender elements (among others). It is not possible, for example, to include an analysis of how a woman outdoor leader/scholar or a person from another culture aligns him/herself with any discursive field(s) and the consequences of such an alignment. Lastly, as this is a qualitative type of research, the investigator is the lens through which any effects of power are seen. As the

researcher and lens, I am located in Canadian society as Bob is and, therefore, am less familiar with some of the patterns and trends in Leo's discourse as he is an American. A different researcher might focus on somewhat different elements or see different patterns arising. A researcher from another culture or a female researcher could approach the analysis from a different perspective for example. These various limitations serve to condition and situate the research. This thesis is not a totalizing account of each participant nor of the effects of the various discursive fields each participant connects with. The various readings and consequences of the effects of power in discursive fields are offered here as a means to begin a dialogue on the subject. This thesis offers one particular perspective on some of the discursive effects. It brings another voice to the table; it does not replace or silence other voices.

Chapter Four:
Description of Ethical Discourse

Introduction

Chapter Four describes some of the mainstream elements of the ethical discourse that both leaders/scholars engage in. There has been little attempt at interpretation in this section. Instead, the purpose of this chapter is to begin to understand some of the depth and complexity of both participants as they engage in creating meanings about who they are, what the natural world is, and how to assign value to the various meanings they create. This chapter interweaves elements of spoken discourse, observed behaviours, and written elements around the theme of environmental ethics. The resulting tapestry is not intended to be a life history of each individual and certainly much has been left out. The focus of this description remained largely with the main elements determined by what the participant vocalized, as well as what the literature in outdoor education and recreation reveals as predominant themes. Lastly, this description and following interpretation are the result of one researcher, in one particular time, observing two particular individuals. The implications of locating myself as a researcher will be explored more in Chapter Six. It is enough, for now, to keep in mind that this description is not a life history, but a product of particular questions brought to bear on particular issues.

Bob's Discourse

Surfacing

The rain was coming down hard–again. It was well into the trip and not for the

first time we were faced with rain. We were cold and wet and tired; the spirit of the group seemed down. I can remember hearing what I thought was wind rustling in the trees over a nearby hill. As I listened the wind got closer; only it was not wind, but hail. Almost instantly visibility was reduced to less than a couple of metres. The person in the front of my canoe faded from visibility, and the water danced with the impact of each hail ball. When visibility cleared, I looked over to the shore where Bob was standing in his bright yellow rain suit. He had been explaining, just moments before the hailstorm broke, of the significance of an old abandoned cabin beside him. After the storm passed (and then circled back twice in twenty minutes!), Bob spoke a few words to the group.

What he said was inconsequential. It was his energy, the way he talked of the power of nature and the awesome spectacle we had just been witness to. It was as if the energy of the storm had done more than just pass over us; it had passed through us, leaving in its wake some residual charge. Watching Bob was like watching the storm made live again through his words and actions. I thought about what Bob had said earlier of wanting to surface the already existing relationship with the earth that everyone has. I could see in Bob's reaction to the storm how closely he was affected by the rhythms of nature, how near to the surface his relationship with the earth was. This was not an act, nor was it rehearsed. It was an expression of the relationship Bob has, not only with the environment in general, but more specifically with the particular area we were travelling through. Bob has been leading trips in this part of Canada for years, and this trip marked his eighteenth with university students through this particular lake and river system–no wonder he feels a connection with the land, a mirroring of its rhythms.

Surfacing the relationship one has with the land is not something Bob feels he can do for the group. As the leader, Bob claims that he can only help structure the atmosphere to be more conducive for this relationship to surface, but the student needs to be ready and willing to do the surfacing. As Bob points out, "it should be added at the outset that people heal and learn from their own will and needs. The guide and educator creates an ambience for possible outcomes" (Henderson, in press, p. 9). Although Bob wishes not to overly control the experience and outcomes of the students, he does acknowledge an overt attempt on his part to create the curriculum to be conducive to producing the outcome of surfacing a relationship between the earth and the students. The process of creating the ambience and seeing what outcomes result for the students leads Bob to distinguish between instilling and distilling. Bob distills, not instills, the relationship people have with the earth. He helps students to realize they are already connected. It is a surfacing, or drawing up, of that relationship, not the instilling of one. He cannot instill into the group this sense of relationship with the land, because it already exists within the student. Instead, he introduces the land to the students, lets it speak to them, and then watches what happens. Our relationship with the land stems in part from our historical connection; we are connected by what has come before. To help create an atmosphere conducive to surfacing an already existing relationship with the land, Bob throws into the mix various historical elements, a short vignette about an old cabin on a deserted lake, for example.

Storying the Land

The story Bob was telling moments before the hailstorm was of a murder that had occurred long ago and of the body that was found half decomposed in the bush. Bob conjectures that the cabin we stood next to was the very cabin in which the murder took place. The sudden fury of the storm a fitting foil for the human drama. It is through these small vignettes that Bob hopes to distill in the students a deeper sense of the world around them. Distill, not instill. The connection and relationship with the earth that Bob speaks of already always exists within us. In this sense, Bob feels that he distills this connection, helps it surface; he never instills or creates it.

Bob himself feels the depth of the land's history, and as he travels through it he wants the students to feel the layered history of events that have transpired here. His writing on the travels and adventures of explorers (Henderson, 1993) reflects his desire to story the land, as do the readings he chooses on the trip. For example, one evening he reads to the group an excerpt from the story of the Canadian arctic explorer Art Moffatt. Moffatt and crew spent three months on the Barrens in the North West Territories in the 1950's. Moffatt had developed a particular philosophy toward the land that Bob hopes his own group of students will appreciate, if not adopt to some degree. Moffatt encouraged the members of his group to learn to live with the rhythms of the land, stopping when it seemed right, taking in the beauty of the Barrens, and being far more concerned with where they were than where they were going.

Moffatt's tale, and others Bob tells, help to give the land a history, as well as provide alternative ways for travelling through it. The land becomes more than a surface

concept to be moved through as quickly as possible; it becomes a place with a beauty and depth that reaches back to the past, then moves into the present, and on to the future. The land is old, and to follow in the footsteps of the people who have travelled here in ages past is to begin to surface this connection in the present. For Bob, students who look about in wonder and speak wistfully of being the first people to ever put foot on the land miss the full wonder of the place. Bob wants to story the land, to unfold the land's rich tapestry with the students. Etched on the earth, entangled among the trees, and lying beneath the dark surface of the water resides a rich and long heritage to explore. Bob introduces students to this depth so that they too can begin to feel the energy of the storm as connected to the history of the people who came before.

Ceremony

One example of the ceremonies Bob uses is the tea ceremony. Our first night at the outpost, Bob divides the whole group into smaller groups and sends each off with one leader. Bob takes his group back toward the woods and has us sit down on a tarp under the stars. Without saying a word, he begins to pass around cups of tea. He motions for us to drink and look around. We spend about fifteen minutes in silence looking around before Bob leads us back to the main lodge. On the way back, Bob pulls me aside and says that he hopes the students will come to recognise the land as having an active role in their experience. Instead of going on a trip through the land, the land takes the students on a trip through itself. This is reflective of Bob's notion that we already know at a deep level our bond with the earth, and Bob hopes to re-awaken in us the knowledge and

experience of that connection.

Bob also uses ceremonies/activities to accomplish this distilling of history and connection with the earth. At the end of a particularly long portage, Bob gathers our group around and tells us of one tradition of the Voyageurs. He speaks of the Voyageurs' legendary (and largely exaggerated!) strength and stamina on portages, of their support for each other along the trail, and of their ritual ending for long portages. On our trip, Bob brings out a small bottle of rum to re-enact the Voyageurs' ritual celebration of the ending of an arduous portage. We each drink a capful to celebrate our successful completion of the portage and mark this as a landmark on our trip.

In another instance, Bob includes a mini-vigil activity along a short hiking trail. He asks the students to go off on their own for about ten minutes and just sit or lie down and relax. Bob's hope is that spending some time alone will help the group understand and begin to value nature without the distractions of other people around. Mini-vigils like this are an attempt by Bob to move the students in a certain direction, to help them see nature in ways they normally do not have (or make) the opportunity to do so. Bob struggles against what he sees as a strong pull toward the social aspects on a trip such as this one; students often feel as though they are back at summer camp and want to spend time getting to know each other outside the confines of school. Bob would like to soften the pull to the social by having the students explore their connections to nature through activities such as mini-vigils.

These ceremonies/activities (Voyageurs' portage ceremony, mini-vigils, and the tea ceremony), among others, are designed to help distill from the group a sense of history

and connection to the land. Through the use of ceremonies and activities, Bob hopes the students will come to see the land as more than just a surface through which they travel; it becomes a living, evolving, changing story in which they are writing the most current chapter.

Language

Bob also uses words and concepts from other languages to convey some of his understanding of what wilderness and nature can be for people. Two words in particular come to mind: *yugen* and *friluftsliv*. The first is a Japanese term, which Bob explains to the group refers to that in nature which touches us deeply, yet remains just beyond description in language. If language cannot fully capture the experience of nature, then an outdoor leader such as Bob cannot rely exclusively on language to distill an experience of nature from the students. In fact, Bob questions how much control a leader can have in bringing about *yugen* experiences: "as a leader you have the opportunity...not to dictate where the trip's going...but to manipulate (I'm using that word carefully)...the experiences toward certain goals–not to certain goals, because you don't control it." The term *yugen* suggests that there are aspects of nature that will only disclose themselves to a person through experience. Hence, Bob speaks of his role as a leader in analogies such as "throwing things into the mix" and "creating an atmosphere," rather than as a teacher who directly instills a sense of connection. Establishing a bond with nature is more about re-membering than teaching, more about finding yourself in nature and discovering how you are connected than being told. Nature travel experiences for Bob have more to do with

experiencing the inexpressible than clearly defining and delineating the event.

The other term, *friluftsliv*, is "a Norwegian word denoting a quality of outdoor education as lived experience in nature. It concerns an aspiration towards a genuine meeting face to face: nature in its primacy, as it genuinely is!" (Henderson, 1997a, p.93). On this trip, Bob introduces the students to *friluftsliv*, hoping they will come to experience nature as "home with a quietly celebrated, respected presence, not an awe-struck spirit of worshipped otherness. The tonic of *friluftsliv* is for a nature that gets (seeps) under one's skin, solidifying in our being, not for nature as a halo we worship outside ourselves" (Henderson, 1997a, p. 93). The immediate concern of *friluftsliv* is teaching the practical skills needed to live with, not against or over the land. Bob's trip is organized to reflect this emphasis. The first few days are spent at the outpost, adjusting to the new lifestyle and learning the skills necessary for the canoe trip portion (i.e., canoeing, camp-craft, packing food and pitching tents). For Bob, *friluftsliv* is more about coming home than leaving home. He hopes for a "free, nature-inspired lifestyle, not a departing from a village/city but an actual arrival to authentic home" (Henderson, 1997a, p. 93). Bob writes that *Friluftsliv* is more about this authenticity than a vacationer's superficial sensibilities (Henderson, 1997a).

The words that Bob employs are an attempt to overcome some serious issues he sees in the English language. Language, as Heidegger states, "already hides in itself a developed way of conceiving" (quoted in Henderson, 1998, p.17). The English language hides in itself a dualistic way of conceiving of the world. When we use English to describe nature, we are trapped into awkward dualistic representations of the world. We say "see

the deer running by," instead, as the Hopi do, "see the deer passing through me" (Henderson, 1998). What Bob counsels is the adoption of "words to displace duality and psychic numbing. We need words that open our spirit toward a 'developing way of conceiving' linking our psyche with the earth" (Henderson, 1998, p. 17). Toward this end, Bob uses words from other languages on his trips to give the students some cognitive alternatives for framing the experience–alternatives he advocates as less dualistic. He has also, as editor of Pathways: The Ontario Journal of Outdoor Education, developed a column expressly dedicated to "words from other languages that can help us express that which is poorly expressible (in English anyway)" (Henderson, 1998, p.17).

The Second Tier

For Bob, environmental ethics has two tiers. The first tier, Bob ventures, is the one which most people think of when asked about environmental ethics: minimum impact practices. Bob's trips and courses do include a focus on certain minimum impact practices. For example, he once brought the students to his home to have them assess his lifestyle. The students found that Bob's lifestyle was fairly ecologically friendly (i.e., he recycles and re-uses when feasible), which, as we will see, is an outgrowth of Bob's internalization of environmental issues. Bob values treading lightly on the earth and strives to accomplish these practices in his own life, but there another tier to Bob's environmental ethic: cultural questioning. While minimum impact is an important area for Bob, he tends to spend more time on the cultural questioning tier of environmental ethics. Bob "really believe[s] we are facing a socio-cultural ecological crisis that implores our responsible

action as educators" (Bickerton and Henderson, in press, p.3). The responsible action Bob is advocating is more than just minimum impact practices. Bob is also urging North Americans to examine their culture and values: "Naming the environmental crisis as a moral crisis is to pinpoint the human value system which underlies the same political and economic decisions that serve to perpetuate large scale environmental degradation" (Bickerton and Henderson, in press, p. 5). Bob sees challenging this value system as an ethical responsibility that should form the foundation of outdoor education as much as developing personal change and growth, which adventure education tends to highlight. When challenging cultural values is included in outdoor education programmes, climbing a rock becomes more than an exercise in self-discovery or trust. Rock climbing, as well as other outdoor pursuits, have value for self-growth, but they are also vehicles for engaging in questioning cultural assumptions about humanity's place in the world. Bob recommends that outdoor educators see nature as more than a backdrop or an instrument for growth; they should see it as "a sustaining place to which we are bound in responsibility, action, and celebration" (p. 8).

Cultural questioning is about creating "a way of being in the out of doors that disorients people so they can find their...lost consciousness with the earth." From this disorientation, Bob hopes that people may begin to question their lifestyles and the ways they relate to the earth. One example Bob gives of cultural questioning in order to disorient students occurred on an earlier trip:

> I write and talk about pulling out my guitar and playing a song just when people are getting anxious about getting to the campsite, and

> I'm the only one that realizes how much work has to be done. So...out comes the guitar and the first time I did it I just thought, "Oh well, I just feel like this is the right thing to do, and I wish we could just enjoy the music and not have people wanting to get to the campsite, which we don't need to rush to." Now that's working culture...and I'm always trying to create these scenarios to de-familiarize people from their conventional ways.

In this example, Bob perceives the students as falling into the trap of rigid scheduling. While on canoe trips, Bob encourages the students to exist in a world less ruled by the clock and schedules. There is no reason to get to the campsite if it means rushing and not enjoying the moment. Bob connects his playing of the guitar to more than simply enjoying the music; playing guitar at what is perceived as an inappropriate moment is a way of shaking the students out of habitual ways of being in the world. Bob specifically tries to include events and activities like this that will disorient people, that will help people question cultural assumptions. He wants people to see that perhaps they do not have to be culturally determined: they can, instead, be self determined. Cultural questioning is not always enjoyable. It "might be liberating, and it might be euphoric, but it might also be very disorienting and very unpleasant. And maybe they [the students] don't want to go there; they make the choice."

Bob hopes that the cultural questioning he engages in will be liberating for the students. He wants people to surface their relationship with the earth, but he also recognizes that not everyone will be comfortable with this and that, in the end, it is a

choice each person has to make. This connects with Bob's emphasis on creating an atmosphere to distill a relationship rather than trying to instill one. The kinds of cultural questioning Bob engages in on his trips are designed to introduce the students to another way of being in the world, through which their relationship with the earth can be distilled. Techniques Bob uses to create the atmosphere on his trips are varied, but "in all, there can be the healing effort to disorient oneself from the culture comfort zone for the resurfacing of latent qualities within. The strength of one's embodied knowing of the earth, one's receptivity and allurement for the earth are shockingly powerful" (Henderson, in press, p. 8). Bob hopes that at least some of the students will see this new way of being as liberating and exciting. Bob certainly feels this way himself and supports a discourse that posits that exposing students to alternative ways of thinking about how they exist in the world may be liberating. While culturally challenging the students may be uncomfortable for some, the overall goal of Bob's environmental ethic, in relation to cultural questioning, is to create a "really great positive sweeping time." The discourse that Bob engages in constructs the students as culturally determined, and is based on the idea that disorienting them from this determinism will be both unsettling and exciting. The grand sweeping time Bob promotes on his trips is both a result of culturally disorienting experiences and a way to draw the students into challenging their own cultural habits. Bob believes that if people do not have a good time, they will not come to challenge their culturally determined ways of being in the world and surface their relationship with the earth.

The feeling that some students do get Bob calls (part tongue in cheek) "emancipatory euphoria," which is the only way he can understand why an incredibly shy

person is on top of the van air-guitaring "Born in the USA." "And I don't know exactly what is happening to draw that fellow out that way, but I know that the central thing was the incredibly good time, and not just an incredibly good time socially." Bob's trips are designed to be an incredibly good time, but without the usual conventions of most young university students (i.e., partying, music, drinking etc.). Instead, it is love for the earth, love for skiing, love for canoeing, or love of camping that Bob feels produces this emancipatory euphoria. Bob encourages this love: "I want the people to love where they're canoeing more than the technique of canoeing." Wanting the students to love nature and to have emancipatory euphoria places Bob in the discursive field of outdoor education. This discourse rests on the idea that by placing students in nature in an atmosphere outside their regular lives, the joy and magic of nature will begin to impress itself upon them. Outdoor educators like Bob often feel that love of nature and the outdoors causes an incredibly good time (not exclusively social) that in turn can provide the motivation for examining some of the culturally disorienting questions Bob places before the students. The discursive field of deep ecology, which Bob works in, aims to expand students' self identity to include the whole earth, and Bob's culturally challenging questions and surfacing a relationship with the earth are indicative of this goal.

Body and mechanical time.

As noted, Bob uses various readings during the trip to illustrate some of the concepts he hopes will be culturally disorienting and to help create an atmosphere in which the self-identity of the students can be expanded to include all of the earth. One of

the concepts that Bob focuses on in the readings is the distinction between body time and mechanical time. Mechanical time is based on clocks and schedules; we eat when it is time to eat, not necessarily when we are hungry. Body time, on the other hand, deals with natural rhythms and flows; we eat when we are hungry, not when the clock strikes noon. For Bob, body time is well suited for trip life–in nature, there is little need for a watch–while mechanical time is the norm when people live in the city.

Body time and mechanical time is a theme that can be seen running through much of what Bob does on the trip. For example, the emphasis Bob places on body time can be seen in the pedagogical approach he takes. Starting on the first night, Bob attempts to do things that "remind [the students of] where they are and [to] stop and look around and view the place." One of these first night activities is the tea ceremony that was mentioned earlier. Bob never spoke in ours, never mentioned what time it was, nor how long the tea ceremony would take. He seemed to be trying to create a timelessness during the tea ceremony by focussing the students on darkness and mist that surrounded them instead of the time. Another example is Bob's spontaneous guitar playing. Bob played not when his watch said it was time, but when he felt it was the right time. Timing became more fluid, not bound by the clock, but by moods and patterns. It is experiences like these that Bob uses to culturally challenge the group by switching to the unfamiliar body time (used in nature) as opposed to the more familiar mechanical time (used in urban settings).

<u>The warm and the cold.</u>

Another way Bob illustrates the differences between urban and wilderness living

and tries to culturally challenge the students is through the distinction he makes between a warm experience and a cold one. Part of the problem Bob sees in our world is that

> technology tends…to have become something that I believe personally tends to strip us a little bit of...[an] understanding and awareness because we tend to lose sight of the context of a resource and lose sight of the immediacy of a resource. We turn on a switch–we have electricity...We've not, for a second, thought about where that electricity comes from, what resources are used. We're completely stripped from the procurement....The means and ends are all lost for us. We live our lives this way for the most part. We eat at a fast-food McDonald's restaurant and we don't stop to think for a second–why would we–where the food comes from, how it was handled, where the money goes? Whereas when you do bannoc around the campfire and you've packed that trip and you've baked the bannoc...that's another whole experience.

Bob uses the term "cold experiences" or the word "device" to express a lack of connection between the means and the end. McDonald's and electric furnaces are cold devices because we use them without seeing any connections to larger forces or patterns. We are unconnected with how the food arrives to us and where the waste goes; we turn on a switch and we have electricity. A "warm experience" or "thing," on the other hand, is something to which we are connected. We know intimately its history and, often, its future. For example, Bob says,

> the canoe is a thing for sure, because if we want to get from A to B, we're very much directly connected to the means. It's a pretty rich thing in people's lives. And that I think is one of the reasons that people are getting off on this experience....We've lost track of something, we've lost track of direct engagement with the world [and the canoe is one way of recovering it]. And technology is doing that, in my opinion, in the form of electric furnaces, which strip us of the means, the understanding of the context.

Bob is trying to create more warm things in people's lives. He feels that we are already surrounded by too many cold devices and seeks to challenge the students to find more things in their lives.

Switching to body time and becoming connected to things instead of devices are both ways that Bob attempts to create a culturally disorienting experience for the students. The discursive field of outdoor education, which Bob is both part of and helps to create, suggests that there are powerful emotions associated with contact with nature. These powerful emotions can, in turn, fuel the students' desire to explore other ways of being in the world, ways based on a recognition of their connection to the earth. Whereas the discursive field of outdoor recreation often emphasizes minimum impact practices, outdoor education moves (carrying Bob's discourse along with it) into the creation of emotionally connected knowledge about who we are as ecological beings and what the implications of such a recognition are.

Leo's Discourse

A Rich History

As I stepped onto the grass I could see the line of cars and vans in front of me. There were about 30 people milling around in various stages of packing; boats on the ground and on the vans; bags and gear all over the place; paddles and PFD's everywhere. A trip in the initial stages of getting ready. It looked like chaos, but it was a familiar sight. I searched for Leo amidst all this. He stood in the middle being bombarded with questions on everything from what was the right kind of equipment, to where was the bathroom, to how much longer until we left. To all of this, I was going to add yet another element. I felt a little like a loose canon–the wild card. Leo had enough to do without worrying about a graduate student from another country. I half expected him to pass me over, filing my presence away until things settled down and he could turn his attention my way. Instead, as soon as he saw me he came over, introduced himself, and helped me get oriented.

I had the task of coming to understand Leo's environmental ethic, how he practices it, and how power is mobilized within this ethic. No easy task, for Leo is a complicated individual with a long history in the outdoor education and recreation field. Perhaps this history helps explain Leo's ability to juggle the many different aspects of the pre-trip stage. He had a way of directing without being overbearing, of dealing with all the loose ends, unexpected last minute details and curve balls that a trip like this can throw at you (i.e., one student, just minutes before we were to leave, realized that he did not have a PFD and the university did not have any extras), yet not appear stressed or

short tempered.

As I got to know him during the drive to the put-in, more about his history came to light. It was 1970, on an National Outdoor Leadership School (NOLS) trip, that Leo had his first extended wilderness trip. Leo and the participants were loaded onto the back of a flatbed truck with some sheep and driven to the drop-off point. This was to be a 35 day mountain trip: the pinnacle of NOLS's programme. With little or no previous background, the participants were to learn the basics of self-sufficient wilderness travel. Leo remembers someone asking about the sheep and was told that they were merely bringing them along to be dropped off later. Once they got to the start of the hike, the leaders told them to pack their stuff and that they were leaving in 45 minutes.

"What about food?" someone asked.

"There" came the answer.

Everyone looked over to the sheep that were tied to a nearby tree. Leo chuckles at the memory of the faces of everyone as they realized what they were being told. With only 45 minutes, the group got started killing the sheep and putting the meat in Ziplock bags. Whether they were ready or not, in 45 minutes the leaders left. "Self-sufficient travel" Leo emphasized again. That's what they were being taught.

At the end of that 35 day NOLS course, the instructors put the participants into groups of 3-4, took away all the food, and told them they were on their own for the next 5 days on a hike through the alpine high-country to the trailhead (about 40 miles of trail). The purpose of this challenge was to show the participants that they had the capability to travel through the mountains without instructors and without food; it was a way to help

them realize they had more capabilities and strengths than they realized. This was the final challenge for the group. After some student deaths in the 1970's and 1980's, many large outdoor leadership schools had to change their policy regarding extended instructor absence experiences. Any such organization now requires more staff supervision.

Leo admits that he was one of the lucky ones on the trip. He had just come back from spending two years at sea with the United States of America Navy and was used to long days and arduous conditions. The thought of killing his own food or being thrown on his own resources in the bush was a challenge he could handle. Not everyone in his group was so fortunate. Not that it was easy for Leo or that he would want to do it over again, and as I sat in the new, fully equiped Voyager van rented from the university, I felt very far removed from that first trip in 1970. He tells me that times have changed, and I smile at the understatement.

Historical influences, like the trip in 1970, have contributed to Leo's passion for wilderness areas. Another influence in Leo's life is Catholicism:

> Part of it is growing up Catholic, I think. Catholic religion is full of rituals. Full of [all] kinds of majestic, awe inspiring kinds of things. Everything from the way the churches are designed, to...very ritualistic evening and night services,...vigils and the missions and the midnight mass and the incense and the candles, you know, all of it...tended to be awe inspiring.

Leo uses rituals on his trips to highlight the sense of majesty and awe he feels in the wilderness. One of the first things Leo does on our trip is ask the students to find a place

all to themselves, have lunch, and just be with nature. Leo tells us it is time to pay some attention to the special place (nature) we are entering. Too often, Leo relates, people in modern society go about their business without really noticing where they are. During the next forty-five minutes, the only sounds are the birds and the wind moving slowly through the tress as we all sit in silence and enjoy our lunch. Near the end of our trip, Leo once again celebrates silence. He has the group sit at night on the shore of the river as a way of celebrating quiet and darkness–something Leo feels is missing from most people's lives. These events serve to create an atmosphere of ritual. By focussing attention on the beauty and tranquillity of nature, they demarcate the space as special. Nature becomes something unique and deserving of our attention, love, and respect. Like the Catholic rituals of Leo's youth, nature can become awe inspiring.

Leo speaks fondly of growing up on a farm and of being "very close to the land, and in a very non-urban environment, a very rural, isolated kind of environment." Throughout his life he has been fascinated by isolated, large vistas and non-urban space. Early on he felt the wonderment large open expanses of land with little or no human influence could create in him:

> I've always been fascinated by large vistas....And then going to NOLS [National Outdoor Leadership School] awakened my sense of wonder about the mountains and the west. And I've kind of had a love affair with the mountains and the west since. And I think that led to an attraction to wilderness, particularly wilderness in the west, and I think then that personal attraction to wilderness has led to my wanting

> to pay attention to the environmental integrity of those particular kinds of areas. Even more so than where I live.

Both growing up on a farm and being exposed to the mountains in the west helped to form Leo's appreciation and love for large, uninhabited wilderness areas. These were formative forces in Leo's life that helped create a sense of the awe and majesty that comes from spending time in large uninhabited landscapes.

Lastly is Leo's experience in the United States of America Navy. Leo's two years at sea helped to prepare him for his experience on that NOLS course in 1970, but it also was formative of some of the values he holds dear:

> I loved the sea. The sea was just a huge wilderness area that was vast and powerful and serene and exciting and scary, all those things at one time: uncontrollable, unrestrained. And that's what I like about wilderness. So that's part of what wilderness means to me that whole spiritual, awe, majestic, powerful, greater than I am, greater than human's are.

Again, the importance of uninhabited places and great vistas are central elements in developing Leo's attraction to wilderness areas. Large, undisturbed areas are valued by Leo because of the emotions they can produce, and because of a connection to Catholicism. The discourse Leo employs creates a value system that is based on more than simply his personal likes, dislikes, and feelings of awe. God's power is made visible for Leo in the almost incomprehensible vastness of the ocean. The majesty that Leo experiences in large wilderness areas connects to his Catholicism; it is easy for him to

connect the great expanse of the ocean or a mountain range with the power of God.

To these ideas he adds another: wilderness is something that transcends humans. Wilderness, for Leo, is ideally large, unspoiled areas that manifest larger than human forces. Storms on mountain tops or at sea bring home how small a person is. We cannot stop the storm; we have no control over it; and it cares nothing for us. These types of experiences (not to be found elsewhere) produce a sense of awe, majesty, and wonderment in Leo in part because they transcend the human. As Leo says, "some of the transcendentalists believed that nature was a symbol of God, and I think that's probably the way I believe too." A transcendent wilderness also connects back to Catholicism. God transcends the human, and nature can be seen as either symbolic of or a manifestation of God's transcendence. Leo values large, untouched, non-urban wilderness areas largely because of who he is, and who he is, is connected to historical forces like Catholicism, growing up on a farm, serving with the United States of America Navy, and early experiences with the western mountains.

The Land Ethic

Leo states that there is a separation between the historical factors that have influenced him and his environmental ethic. Historical factors provide the background for his ethic and part of the motivation for him to head out into the wilderness. Leo has a love for wilderness, it a very special place for him that provides unique experiences of awe, majesty, and spiritual encounters and this prompts him to want to care for it. For Leo, an ethical framework is a system of moral guidelines that lead to certain actions

taken toward the environment (McAvoy, 1990a), which he separates from the emotional and spiritual benefits that form the motivation for adopting a particular ethical framework. In Leo's case, the desire to care for wilderness finds expression in Leopold's concept of the land ethic:

> I think Leopold's expression of environmental ethics seems to make sense to me. I've looked at some of the other definitions; ecofeminism, deep ecology–some of the others–and they don't seem to...resonate as clearly as Leopold's definition does for me. So that's why I have...focussed in on that, because that's a definition I can understand and I can relate to.

On the first day of the trip, after the vigil over lunch, Leo introduces the students to Leopold's ethical framework as a way for them to frame the upcoming experience. He runs a quick processing session after the vigil to help focus the students and sums it up with Leopold's (1949/1989) "A thing is right when it tends to preserve the integrity, stability, and beauty of the biotic community. It is wrong when it tends otherwise" (p.224-225). Leopold's and Leo's discourse of the land ethic focuses on placing humans as a member of a biotic community. The vigil Leo has the group experience is one way he tries to have the students begin to acquaint themselves with the land they are entering. He asks us to spend some time looking at and experiencing what he calls the special place we are entering. He wants us to begin to value our place in it, not as conquerors, but as fellow inhabitants of the natural world. According to the land ethic, we share this biotic community with many other members, and Leo hopes that by spending some time away

from other humans, we might begin to see in the area we are entering, the diversity of members in it as well as the connections between those members.

The biotic community.

The biotic community has value for Leo not only because of what it can provide (spiritual and awesome experiences), but also because of what it inherently is. Leo exhorts the moral philosophy that we should seek only that which is good for us and nothing else (Dustin, McAvoy and Schultz, 1991[7]). What distinguishes this moral philosophy from others is how "we" and "us" are defined. Dustin, McAvoy, and Schultz (1991)

> do not limit the 'we-ness' or the 'us-ness' to each individual or the human family as a whole. We extend the meaning of the terms to include all living things...we are morally obliged to seek out those recreational pleasures which contribute to the physical and mental health, the sense of being lover and loving, the feelings of belonging and self-esteem, and the growth and development of life in its entirety (p. 100).

This system of valuing the biotic community, Dustin, McAvoy, and Schultz (1991) link to Albert Schweitzer's reverence for life ethic. Leo supports an ethic, similar to Schweitzer,

---

[7] References such as this one to writings that Leo co-authored or are older should not necessarily be taken as indicators of what Leo believes now. I am making connections between ideas and noticing patterns in discourse, not performing a phenomenological study. Leo has had an impact in shaping the discourse of outdoor recreation and education, and the patterns he help author exist beyond his own beliefs about them.

that reveres all things with a will to live (i.e., those entities that seek to realize a certain form–an acorn seeks to become an oak tree, an ecosystem seeks to remain homeostasis). It is a system or framework that values the community of life in all forms, not just the human form (Dustin, McAvoy, and Schultz, 1991).

Leo focuses on natural and wild areas–biotic communities–and defines the environment as "the classic definition that Leopold gave, which is the natural systems of earth, air, water, wildlife, vegetation." The concept of biotic communities ties Leo into an ecological discourse that sees wilderness as larger than just a single river or tree–wilderness consists of whole ecosystems. In ecological discourse, ecosystems often refer to interdependent entities in an interrelated homeostatic relationship (van Wyck, 1997, Zimmerman, 1994). To this understanding of nature, Leopold (1949/1989) added that ecosystem characteristics were valuable in themselves (i.e., a homeostatic system has integrity, is beautiful, and should be valued for those qualities). A discourse that values beauty in ecosystems fits well with Leo's love of vast wilderness areas. Much of what Leo reminisces about from his childhood can be described as an ecosystem (i.e., a mountain range or a system of valleys and watersheds). Not surprisingly, Leo's ethic echos a discourse in ecology because it is through concepts like "biotic communities" and "ecosystems" that Leo sees beauty and integrity in wilderness at a scale not visible at smaller levels. In Leo's words, wilderness (as composed of biotic communities) provides

> opportunities for the awe, majestic, spiritual kinds of overpowering feelings. And its caused by the vastness of the landscape, by the vastness and the power and the lack of human influence....to be

> paddling down that river yesterday and look up and see a Bald Eagle with the sparkling blue water, the dark green trees, the perfectly blue sky and a Bald Eagle flying over, it just a very... that's a very awesome experience, for me. Not everybody, but for me, it takes my breath away and I start to cry. I get emotional, and when I have to speak about it in front of people I get emotional.

A powerful testament to the strength of emotions Leo has toward wilderness. The emotions Leo feels when in these types of wilderness areas are in part created because of his discourse of the land ethic. Leo's discourse both creates these emotions and is created by his emotions; they are mutually defining. The awe, majesty, and spiritual feelings that Leo has when he is in wilderness areas form the drive behind his environmental ethic. Leo strives to protect wilderness areas because of the awe and spiritual experiences these areas produce in him, and these feelings, in turn, help create the environmental ethic he holds. Protection of wilderness areas is also connected in Leo's discourse to the benefits Leo sees these areas have for all of humanity. Valuing wilderness is more than simply a personal issue for Leo. Certainly there is a personal reason; Leo plainly states that he protects these areas in order that he can enjoy them, but his discourse is also about the value wilderness has for the human psyche.

Wilderness provides a powerful metaphor of the frontier. The image of the frontier that Leo speaks of is more than a physical frontier; it is also a metaphysical frontier. Wilderness areas are places that people can begin to get in touch with mythological aspects of what it means to be a human. The metaphor of a journey into the human

consciousness becomes central in the idea of an internal frontier. Wilderness is seen by Leo as a threshold where people can test themselves, come to a fuller understanding of themselves; it is the call to adventure, journey, and odyssey. As Leo says, " you are the wilderness you must explore" (McAvoy and Dustin, 1989, p. 40). The image of a frontier and a journey fits well with large, uninhabited areas; the journeying through the physical space is parallelled with an internal one.

For Leo these are the three main benefits that wilderness can provide (see McAvoy and Dustin, 1989 for a slight variation of these themes). The first is that the wilderness provides the opportunity for awesome, majestic, spiritually overpowering feelings. The second thing wilderness provides is challenge. Leo enjoys the feelings of competence and confidence he gets in knowing that he can exist with nature in difficult situations. He does not feel like he is conquering nature; he is living with it. Lastly, wilderness provides opportunities for a journey into both a physical and metaphysical frontier. Leo is drawn toward the metaphor of the journey, because it contains excitement, challenge, and discovery. The stages of preparation, travel, and recounting afterward provide opportunities to experience challenges; awesome, majestic and spiritual feelings; and for exploring our very nature as human beings.

While important, these three things that wilderness provides are not seen by Leo as part of his ethic. They help in understanding Leo's passion for and valuing of the wilderness, but they are not the framework or guidelines Leo uses when making decisions and taking action with respect to the environment. As Leo points out, "these three things are...why I go to wilderness. I guess the ethic would go back to the issue of being

concerned and caring about the beauty and the integrity of wilderness, of the environment in general." The benefits of wilderness areas provide are the drive and foundation for Leo to adopt an ethical framework, and in turn the framework that he adopts (the land ethic) re-enforces and defines the way he values the land.

Minimum impact.

Minimum impact practices also result from the framework Leo adopts in relation to the environment, but they themselves are not an ethical framework. Leo places a great emphasis on minimum impact, and this can be used to gain further insight into his ethical framework. For example, prior to the trip, Leo had discussed with the class the value of minimum impact around mealtimes. He emphasized concepts such as leaving no trace and packing out whatever food was brought in rather than burying leftovers. While on the trip, Leo left most of the decisions surrounding lunch and snack time up to the group. He interfered as little as possible in the process of mealtimes. This approach left the group to monitor its own behaviour and actions. Leo did double checked each site before leaving to make sure that no large food particles remained, but aside from this, he did not suggest to the group that it adopt any specific minimum impact practices. As an outdoor leader myself, I was curious as to why Leo left many decisions up to the group instead of more overtly enforcing certain practices. An understanding of Leo's ethical framework helps us to see how these actions are consistent with his ethic. For Leo, the environment consists of natural communities, wild ecosystems that humans have had little contact with, or interrelated communities with minimal urbanization. While the individual elements that

comprise these systems are important, the system itself takes precedence. This is not to say that entities in a system are valueless, for as Leo reminds us, "if you concentrate on preserving the integrity of communities, which is what Leopold was talking about, then I think that...moves you toward considering individuals also." An emphasis on systems and biotic communities provides the parameters for how much impact is acceptable. It is not a matter of eliminating impact entirely, because this is impossible. Rather, Leo is more concerned with impacts that threaten the integrity and beauty of the system. For example, he asked a group to move their cooking area away from the other groups because the congestion was damaging the area too much (i.e., trampling the vegetation over a large area of a pristine site), but he feels the impact of a few food crumbs around lunch time is negligible: "spreading a tarp out for a few crumbs is going overboard and people may think this is 'b.s.' and begin not to care about minimum impact as a whole." A connection can be made in Leo's discourse between concern for these larger levels of impact and Leo's emphasis on the beauty and integrity of communities. Leaving a few crumbs behind will do little damage to an ecosystem, and, hence, Leo does not emphasize this as much. He wants people to care about the ecosystem and work to protect and preserve it and is worried that focussing on crumbs at lunch time might overshadow the more important issue of impact at the community level (i.e., people may focus on spreading out a tarp to catch every little crumb, but miss the fact that in order to catch all the crumbs, they need to all gather around the trap, thus concentrating the impacts of trampling). In addition, Leo's experience with the students on his trips is that minimum impact issues can be overdone, which can turn people off the concept entirely. Better to have conscious and

conscientious individuals who drop a few crumbs, than people who don't care or are frustrated with the whole minimum impact concept.

Another example of how actions taken by Leo can be connected to his ethical framework occurred on a portage trail. The trail ran along an old mill and was used often by anglers throughout the season. When our group arrived at the portage head, Leo discussed some concerns about carrying the equipment carefully before we began the portage. His discussion focussed mainly on human factors like safety. Leo and I talked about this event, and I asked him if he was concerned with what had happened to the plants that were lining the trail. He said that although plants are plants and we shouldn't trample them, in a month they would be trampled by anglers anyway so there is not as much a need to protect them as if they had been part of a wild area. He felt that we should not add to the damage, but this portage trail is more like an urban area or a sidewalk.

Although Leo's response was a direct response to my asking why he did not include safety for the plants in his pre-portage discussion, his decision to focus more on humans than on the plants seems in keeping with a land ethic perspective. The discourse of ecology and the land ethic values a certain type of landscape (large, untouched land). As part of this discourse, Leo also emphasizes the value of interrelated, non-urbanized ecosystems. The individual plants along the portage trail are not readily included in this definition of wilderness for two reasons: 1) the plants are not in an untouched area, and 2) they are not a biotic community, but individual elements. Leo's ethical framework values communities over the individual elements in them and natural systems over urban ones, hence, it is a logical outgrowth of this discourse that he is more concerned with impact

that jeopardizes the natural biotic community. Impact resulting from crumbs at lunch or from damaging plants along a highly used portage trail has little effect at the larger level of wilderness ecosystem integrity.

The style of leadership[8] that Leo uses also factors into minimum impact practices. Leo stated that he was concerned at the put-in for the integrity of the river and surrounding area. His concern stemmed from his perception that students new to camping might not know the proper way to handle equipment or themselves, thus risking ecological damage. As an attempt to avoid damage to the wilderness, Leo tells me that he was quite clear at the beginning with where he wanted the group to put the canoes and where and how to set up camp. His actions support this view of his leadership style. Immediately upon getting out of the van at the put-in, he went down to the river to direct the group to put the canoes and gear in one place and to set up camp in another area. He informed me that he did this both for efficiency and to protect the river. "Its not fair," he tells me, "to not tell people how to do things at the start, and then when they make a mistake use it as a teachable moment." Not only would this put the student on the spot, but it also damages the environment. By taking more control at the start of the trip and giving clear directions to the group, Leo is acting out a discourse on leadership that helps to ensure that certain minimum impact standards are met.

Leo constructs leadership issues such that being more directive at the start of the

---

[8] Leadership, in this discussion, is presented as a straightforward, unproblematic concept. I am simply outlining what Leo indicates is his leadership style and the reasons he gives behind his choices. Leadership is a discursive field unto itself that is not uniform, and an investigation of the effect of Leo's construction of leadership encompasses a project distinct from mine here.

trip is needed until people begin to understand the lifestyle of wilderness trips, after which he can move to a more democratic style and allow the group to negotiate and make more of the decisions. Leo describes the process he uses as a leader as first "laying the information out, laying the procedures out, laying the expectations out for people, and then gradually...pulling back and letting people pick up those responsibilities and practice them and kind of internalize that on their own." Slowly, over the duration of a trip, Leo backs off and eases the group into learning about safety, leadership, and responsibility for both themselves and the environment. For example, toward the end of our trip Leo was less directive about doing a sweep of the campsite before we left every morning. He still watched to make sure someone was checking to see if anything was left behind, but he did not assign anyone to conduct the sweep, the group had to make that decision. Had Leo begun with this kind of stand-back behaviour, he worries that too often the sweep would not get done, or done well enough, and stuff would be left behind that could damage the environment.

In regards to minimum impact, type and degree become important for Leo. It is not an ethic of eliminate all impact; impact is inevitable, but there needs to be limits. As Leo says, "I think people are more important than particular pieces of environment. And I think...it's a matter of degree. I don't know that there's any area that is so sensitive that it can't take a few hours of people being on it and be able to recover." If it came down to a choice of saving someone's life or cutting down a tree, Leo says "it'd take me maybe a second to make the decision to get the axe out."

In answer to the question of how much impact should a leader be allowing on

trips, Leo is not willing to sacrifice a person for the land, believing that humans are more important than the land. More importantly, he feels to frame the issue this way is to miss the point. Leo believes it is a very rare case where you would destroy an ecosystem simply by being on it. According to Leo's ethical framework, humans are not an anathema to wilderness; we do not pollute it by our very presence. In most cases the land will recover, and in a few weeks whatever traces were there will not longer be detectable. From this viewpoint, Leo is willing to chop down trees to save a person if need be, because the ecosystem will likely still recover.

If framing the issue in terms of either destroying the environment or saving a person's life misses the point, there is another situation that Leo feels is much more common–How much impact should a leader be willing to cause for the comfort of the students? Leo's answer to this question is split. On one hand he says "I'm not really willing to cause hardly any damage in order to provide for the comfort of people, because I think you can pretty well lead trips with people [who] are uncomfortable. That's ok." Part of the land ethic is caring for the land, and this entails learning to live in harmony with it. As Leopold (1949/1989) stated, with the adoption of the land ethic, humans become a member of the biotic community, not masters over it. For Leo, becoming a member of a larger community also means limiting individual freedom of action. An environmental ethic

> requires a denial of immediate gratification to serve the long-term needs of the environmental community. We are responsible for the health of the biotic community and its capacity for self revival. An environmental ethic will simply add a duty not to cause harm to the

land (McAvoy, 1990a, p.70).

A recognition that humans are a member of a natural biotic community extends existing Western moral frameworks of not harming members of the human community over onto the natural community (McAvoy, 1990a). Issues of comfort become insufficient reason for one member of the community to damage another member.

According to the discourse Leo employs, in order to preserve any wilderness area, we must have an understanding of the processes that community uses in reaching and maintaining a balance. Actions should be judged ethical based on whether or not they disrupt these natural self-sustaining processes, and how much we might have been able to mitigate any disruptive effects (McAvoy, 1990a). It is through minimum impact that Leo attempts to mitigate some of his disruptive actions. Toward this end, leaders should attempt to limit any non-essential (i.e., purely for comfort) behaviour that disrupts the natural self-sustaining processes of biotic communities. Because Leo loves wilderness, he works not only to protect it (i.e., advocacy work for wilderness organizations), but he also examines his behaviour while in wilderness areas and makes decisions based on preserving the beauty, integrity, and homeostatic processes of biotic communities.

One of the self-sustaining processes of wilderness areas that the discourse on minimum impact often focuses on is the ability of these areas to recover from the effects of trampling on soil and vegetation (Cole, 1995a, 1995b; Monz, Cole, Johnson & Spildie, 1994; Monz, Meier, Cole & Welker, 1994). Leo hopes people on his trips and in his classrooms will come to respect and value the wilderness, become more sensitive to issues such as trampling, and then take reasonable steps to reduce these types of impacts.

Reducing this kind of impact sometimes requires a sacrifice of personal comfort. It might be easier and more comfortable to set up the tent closer to the water and on flatter ground, yet if this places the tent in a sensitive area, Leo encourages people to think twice and opt for a less comfortable tent site that will have less impact and help preserve the integrity of the natural area.

Leo's answer to issues of comfort has another side to it. He writes: "People who are not comfortable being outdoors will have a very hard time focussing on anything other than their own discomfort" (Schatz, McAvoy, and Parker, 1993, p.19). This means that poorly dressed people, lack of food, or poorly planned trips can often make environmentally friendly behaviour difficult. For example, students who are cold and wet may find it hard to support minimum impact practices such as reducing the use of fires. It is much easier to sit comfortable around the fire at night and discuss issues, than to be shivering in a tent in the dark.

The approach to leadership that Leo takes is also related to minimum impact issues and attempting to ensure a certain level comfort for the students. He was quite directive with the group at the start of the trip because he was concerned someone might go on the trip without the proper equipment. Here is another example of the concern Leo has for comfort of students. A student without the proper knowledge or equipment is a danger not only to themselves, but also to the environment. Being uncomfortable without adequate equipment might lead to a compromise of some minimum impact practices (i.e., a student may have to make a fire if s/he is cold or wet). If Leo can avoid this by being clear with the requirements and procedures at the start of the trip, he feels he has a

responsibility as a leader to do so.

Appreciating minimum impact practices, then, may require a certain level of comfort, but it seems that the line between when comfort becomes uncomfort or a safety risk is not always clear. Leo admits that it is a matter of degree. Somewhere in his head, he has a line that tells him how much is too much impact, but it is not something that he can articulate down to the smallest detail. Issues of leadership, minimum impact, and comfort intertwine together and inform each other. The discursive fields on these topics are not uniform either, and this helps us understand Leo's discourse. He is, in part, a product of competing discourses on what is good for the environment and how responsible leaders should act.

Leo's emphasis on minimum impact reaches into more areas of his life than teaching and leading trips. Not only does he try to teach his students about various minimum impact practices, he also tries to incorporate these practices into his own life:

> I try to practice minimum impact camping techniques, not only when I'm with students, but also when I'm by myself. And so I try to be very careful with the kind of impacts I have on the environment. I try to be careful where I camp. I go to areas that do not get a lot of heavy use....I go in small groups to have less impact also.

Leo supports minimum impact policies because of the value he places on the environment. As he says, "I have a responsibility to try to maintain the beauty and the integrity and the stability of the environment that I take people into. And one way to try to do that is through minimum impact procedures." Minimum impact is more than a set of practices for

Leo, it is part of his lifestyle. He cannot shut it off when he steps out of a teaching role. The effort he takes to understand and follow minimum impact practices stems not from pedagogical approaches for leading–his pedagogical approach stems from his basic lifestyle values, which include a commitment to minimum impact.

The responsibility Leo feels to follow and encourage minimum impact procedures is connected to his environmental ethic, which in turn leads him to structure courses, trips and his own behaviour in such a way as to minimize the damage done to the wild places. As an outgrowth of his love and passion for wilderness areas, Leo's discourse privileges a certain way to treat biotic communities, a way that reduces the amount of impact he personally has on them. As an outdoor educator, the discourse Leo employs is connected to the style and type of leadership he assumes in an attempt to both protect the area he is in, and also to pass along to his students a similar commitment to minimum impact practices.

Chapter Five:
Analysis

Introduction

Exploring some of the themes of Bob's and Leo's discourse was the subject of last chapter. In this chapter I will apply various critiques of environmental ethics to produce different readings of how power is employed in Bob's and Leo's discourse. None of these readings should be taken as totalizing or normalizing accounts; they are different readings, not the only one. As Orlie (1997) states, power is a creative force that has many implications, and to suggest one reading as the only possible one is to miss the complexity of the discursive world we live in. As well, the move to resolve perceived contradictions is a move that reduces the diversity and complexity of the world and has a normalizing effect. There can be many different readings of discourse without a need to resolve them into one. A variety of implications can co-exist, and they become positive or negative depending on how we position ourselves as readers. The point to remember is that however we define positive and negative, both can be read in discursive fields. As well, positives and negatives only hold their meaning when seen from a particular standpoint. When power is seen as something that circulates through discourse, is exercised constantly, and creates meaning, everything becomes dangerous in that there is no guarantee of only positive results. The challenge I am highlighting is to engage in the creation of discourse in such a way that we use power carefully, not to remove all the negatives implications, but to be conscious of as many of them as we can, so we can carefully choose which ones to support/create.

In the following sections, I take a number of different positions from which to view Bob's and Leo's discourse. These positions will help to demonstrate that there are many possibly ways to read the implications of their discourse. These readings are not exhaustive of the possibilities. I offer them as some additions to the way outdoor recreation and education has traditionally been read (which has largely been as a field that does good for the world). The readings I offer are not to be taken as "either/or" (i.e., either the field does "good" or it does "bad"), but additions (i.e., the field of outdoor education and recreation always creates both benefits and harms, and the particular configuration of benefits and harm is discursively created). Whether or not people change their actions as a result of these readings is less a focus than opening the space in which additional readings can be undertaken. As long as the field of outdoor recreation and education remains closed to other readings of its discourse, it will remain naive to the complexity of the discursive world that it moves in, which will reduce its capacity to create and shape that world.

Bob's Discourse

The Puppet and the Puppeteer: Ecological Ventriloquism

Van Wyck (1997) has critiqued deep ecology as performing a ventriloquism with respect to nature that masks both the authority and the authorship of the human agent (see Chapter Two). He has also read deep ecology's Self-identification, motivated by the will to totality, as a move to the outside that reduces diversity. Bob's discourse is also connected to the idea of Self-identification, and in this section I will apply some of van

Wyck's (1997) critiques to Bob's discourse to explore some less obvious implications of how discursive power as seen through Bob's discourse.

Bob speaks of wanting the students to surface their relationship with the earth. He hopes that after (or during) the trip at least some of the students will begin to see the ways they are always, already interconnected to the earth: the beginnings of Self-identification. Bob believes "that all people are already engaged with the earth; they just need to peel off some layers of skin." He also says, "I'm really routed in the idea that we can expand people's self identity, broaden people's self identities for a richer engagement with the earth. And that gets back to the thing and the device...and how we choose to live with technology–we have a choice." Not only can people's self identity be expanded, but Bob feels that outdoor educators play a key role in this process. Through providing an atmosphere that is culturally disorienting and hopefully euphoric, Bob helps the earth surface its relationship with the students. The trips Bob leads are designed to include time for the students to be alone with nature, to spend quiet time reflecting on and just being with nature. This might take the form of a short solo on a hike, or some quiet group time around a campfire in which Bob points out the beauty of the moon and beach. In these activities can be seen the deep ecology notion that we are already connected to the earth; what is needed is an atmosphere conducive to re-membering this connection. To realize this connection is to begin to form an Ecological Self. As Bob says, "I definitely believe this rapport with the natural world is already within, and it needs to be drawn out. That's the central thing from ecopsychology that I think is very valuable because I think it really influences how you go around teaching and stuff."

This notion of wanting to surface a pre-existing relationship between the students and the earth can be read as a ventriloquism, because it reduces the importance of the human subject as agent. Neither Bob nor the students speak for the earth–the earth speaks for itself. The earth is not seen as something in need of representation; it is something that represents itself to us. From a discursive field analysis of deep ecology, the role Bob and the students play, their agency, is seen as masked. The students have an active role in interpreting the experience. They participate in the experiences to the extent that they are not passive vessels waiting to be filled with words from the earth. In Bob's case, he creates the space for the students to have these experiences. For example, he controls the location, the time, and the duration of the tea ceremony, as well as the sequence of events that occur within it. Yet, as van Wyck (1997) suggests, this agency and influence is masked. The earth is portrayed as speaking on its own, as having agency in and of itself. Both Bob and the students are active co-creators of experiences such as the tea ceremony, and this agency is reduced or masked by a discourse that sees the earth as speaking independently to the students.

This masking effect of deep ecology moves Bob to a position from which it is harder for him to acknowledge his agency, which makes, for Bob, a potentially powerful site for resistence. There are many ways to construct the world, and for Bob to consciously engage the ways his relationship with deep ecology manoeuvres him would move him toward a celebration of that manoeuvring. When we adopt an ethic (be it deep ecology or any other), we of necessity trespass on other ways of making it in the world. Deep ecology is not wrong because it trespasses; it is not wrong at all, in the sense that it

should be abandoned. Rather, deep ecology is a partial discourse. It is limited, and it limits other ways. This is merely problematic (as opposed to wrong) and deep ecology needs to be engaged at this level, not thrown out.

Ventriloquism does imply a trick or type of deception, yet it must be noted that this analysis is a critique of the discursive field Bob connects with, not of Bob himself. The issue is not whether or not Bob (or Leo) are tricksters, but how the discourse they align themselves with makes it easier to acknowledge somethings, yet harder to acknowledge others. The discursive field of deep ecology makes it harder to see and work with the ways that the author of the text constructs the experience, because it constructs the earth as author of the text. Bob's engagement of a particular type of deep ecology discourse exerts an influence on how he constructs the world. It is a discursive field that attempts to reduce the agency of the human subject. Bob, as a leader and a scholar, works at acknowledging the way(s) he constructs the world to the extent that he is overt about tying into a deep ecology framework. The critique I am bringing in challenges all outdoor professionals (and even other professionals) to work toward various acknowledgments and celebrations of the ways they construct the world. It is not enough to say that one is a deep ecologist, a land ethic supporter, or any other environmental ethical framework. All of these ethics (and all leaders) have agendas. The challenge is to try and become aware of how our agenda positions us to see certain things, to enable certain things, while limiting or excluding others.

As the leader of the group, Bob is author of the discourse in different ways than the students, yet the text he authors works to mask his very authorship. One aspect of the

authorship Bob has on his trips is his trip goals. Bob has ideas about what he wants to happen overall and the kinds of experiences he is aiming for, and he structures the trip to achieve these goals. While Bob is not ignorant of his goals, his discourse about them does not fully engage the issue of his agency. The goals Bob has for the trip (to surface a personal connection between the students and the earth, to challenge the students culturally, and to help the students learn to care about and for the earth) construct the trip in a certain fashion; they are premised on certain notions of what a student is, what modern society is, and what nature is. These constructions of the world, which play through much of the discursive field of outdoor education, go unacknowledged in outdoor education literature.

According to Bob, the students need to experience nature or experience a new way of knowing the world that is based on "physicalness," on hands on experiences, which will shift the focus from how they normally exist. Ceremonies, an emphasis on body time, a distinction between warm things and cold devices, and the use of words from other languages are all attempts to shift the students, to culturally challenge them, to create an atmosphere where emancipatory euphoria can occur. However, all of these can also be read as ventriloquist manoeuvres. Bob acknowledges his role in providing an atmosphere in which the students can be culturally challenged (i.e., he says he "provide[s] an ambiance, and the students will pick up what there is to learn out there."), but his discourse downplays the significance of this. He speaks of creating an atmosphere and then leaves it at that–"the students will pick up what there is to learn out there." Bob does have an agenda (we all do as leaders), and how he structures the trip and the class

will largely determine what is available "out there" to be learned. The challenge this thesis is highlighting is not to be "agendaless" (this would be the ultimate ventriloquist act–to believe we have no authorship), but instead to work toward an acknowledgement (and even a celebration) of the agenda we do have. In Bob's case, deep ecology exerts an influence toward a denial of the agency in the agenda he has.

The discourse Bob employs constructs wilderness and nature as having some kind of Reality that contains certain lessons. This is a type of ontological phenomenalism that grants a status to nature beyond human discursive construction. The discourse Bob uses casts the leader's role as creating an atmosphere that is conducive for nature to teach what is has to teach; the leader is not seen as creating the nature that in turn teaches certain lessons. If nature was seen as not having any Reality, a shift could occur in Bob's discourse that would take responsibility for the very construction of the earth as something that could speak independently to the students. The ventriloquism would be replaced by a type of conscious tentativeness that comes with the realization that our theories about nature are always constructed. A tentativeness that, in turn, would loosen the grip of theory on Truth.

The ventriloquist nature of the deep ecological discourse of Bob also reduces the diversity of both the students and the earth. All of nature gets subsumed in this discourse within the organic whole of the earth, and every type of student is captured in the category of "student." That different people might have different relationships with the earth, that different aspects of the earth might be important in some situations and not others, or even that some people might not want any relationship with the earth becomes

difficult to promote with only two categories. Bob's overall goals are designed to allow the relationship with the earth and students to surface. Bob hopes the students will begin to see that they already exist in a relationship with the earth, but what type of relationship is left unspoken. There is a type of freedom in Bob's discourse in that the students are encouraged to develop their own relationship with the earth. It is the parameters that limit the range of relationships the students can develop that go unacknowledged. Bob embodies a discourse that speaks as if there were no parameters, and hence does not recognize the ways it conditions and directs the relationships the students can develop. Students who do not see themselves as part of the earth will have a hard time surfacing a relationship that extends their self-identity to include aspects of the earth. Relationships that are based on ideas that the earth is only resource for human use are also more difficult to surface here. Not only is the view that humans can use the planet for economic resource difficult to maintain, but so is the view that the earth is a recreational resource for humans. Much of what Bob does and how he speaks emphasizes the view that the earth is more than resource (no matter how one defines resource); the earth becomes part of ourselves, and we part of it. The discourse Bob aligns himself with moves alternative views out of currency. In the discourse Bob uses, nature becomes a solidified entity; it is not thought of as discursive, and because of this, the types of relationships we should have with it are prescribed a priori.

The discourse Bob employs embodies an assumption: people already exist in a relationship with the earth. Those who do not see this are not ready yet to see it (which is all right, Bob never overtly forces this view onto others), but the relationship still exists.

The assumption Bob works under results in a move to the outside. Everyone is in a relationship, and it is with the totality of the earth. As the type of deep ecology that Bob engages constructs them, "everyone" and "the earth" become complete; they are totals or wholes. In order to see either of these categories in their totality, the theoretical gaze must shift from being embedded within to being situated without. For the category "earth," the gaze gets shifted off the planet; for "everyone," the gaze shifts to a meta-human level. Once the gaze is positioned outside, the inside has less geography, less relief. Differences on the inside becomes less important than differences between the categories. The only way the categories can exist is through the production and maintenance of intra-categorical difference. Certainly there are differences between humans, however, these differences do not affect the "fact" that all humans are already, always in a relationship with the earth. Local human distinctions and flavours fade in favour of larger images, patterns, or forces. Likewise, the ability to perceive the earth as vast and differentiated is lost or at least downplayed when it is conceived of as an organic whole. Pictured from space, the earth is a single entity. Metaphors such as "spaceship earth" speak to the power of this image. Students lying down during a mini-vigil exploring nature on their own are directed by the sub-text of Bob's discourse, which encourages them to try and relate to all of nature. It is not just the tree next to them they are relating to, but the totality of the planet.

Bob uses little processing or debriefing of experiences like the mini-vigil, which is in keeping with the discursive field he supports. Bob feels that everyone is already connected to the earth and that we need to open ourselves to the possibility of exploring

this connection. The connections we have with the earth are seen as arising spontaneously provided the right atmosphere is created. The idea that the earth can speak to people in an unmediated fashion is in keeping with a notion of ontological phenomenalism. If there is an earth out there beyond our construction of it and if we are already always interconnected to it, then providing an atmosphere in which to explore this connection is what is needed. We do not, nor should we, try to dictate the form of this relationship in a processing session; it is a personal relationship that arises from a communication between the student and the earth.

That the earth can speak to people and introduce itself to us might in some ways be a metaphor. Certainly Bob does not speak as if the earth talks in the same way as humans, however, Bob does feel that the earth takes an active role in surfacing its relationship with people. The discourse Bob employs grants an ontological status to the earth that removes human agency from the equation. Bob sees the earth as being there and being able to speak to the students without any construction or mediation from humans, hence, he sees less need for structured processing sessions which attempt to extract (and even create) meaning from encounters with nature. He wants to let the experience (and the earth) speak for itself. This idea is ventriloquist to the extent that it masks the non-verbal effects of Bob's goals, definitions, and structuring of the trip that steer and guide the type of relationship he is promoting between students and the earth. Shifting to a more constructed view of what nature and humans are and how these definitions construct experiences, might help create the opportunity for the leader to see his or her influence on the experience beyond the leading of a processing session. The

idea that because there is no formal processing session and, therefore, the relationship is open to interpretation is to mask the discursive nature and force of the experience. When humans and nature[9] interact, meaning is produced, and the particular meanings and experiences that are created are, from a discursive viewpoint, dependent on the perspectives taken and the definitions that are applied to the interaction, regardless of whether there is a processing session afterward or not.

Of Humans and Nature

By tying into a discursive field of deep ecology, Bob's discourse positions the students who come on his trip as having a singular background. Bob indicates that knowing the students' entry point is an important element in determining how he structures his trips. For example, based on seeing the students as unfamiliar with body time, Bob structures his trips as if all the students will be disoriented. The students are cast as unfamiliar with wilderness trips, unaware of the type of experience Bob is aiming for, and generally not having had the opportunity to live with the land the way Bob encourages on his trips. Bob thinks of the trip as getting

> people on the land really viscerally, in a sweat, bone and marrow kind of way that I think we don't get enough. So its sort of a real initiation time with the land and its also a time with another style

---

[9] Even the categories of "human" and "nature" begin the process of constructing a certain experience. There is no unmediated or non-structured experience; everything is constructed. The task outdoor leaders and educators face is not to eliminate the constructions, but to own whatever constructions they do promote.

> of...epistemology, another way of knowing and being that we can eventually live. So its breaking out of culture a bit and into a bit of a subculture that I think has a lot to teach.

Bob feels that the trip is an opportunity for the students to have an experience that they might not normally get. According to Bob, his role in this experience is to "provide an ambiance and the students will pick up what there is to learn out there." The two main things Bob hopes the students pick up are a relationship with the earth that they might not know they had, and a relationship with a way of knowing, a way of existing, that is different from the students' life outside the trip. As Bob says, "both these two things they typically find very liberating if I've lead the camp right. So the more the camp isn't like school in the city the better." One effect of seeing the students as having a similar entry point is a reduction in the diversity of the human subject, and this allows for a singular treatment of such subjects; all the students need to surface a loving (latent) relationship with the earth. Discursively constructing the students as a single category and the trip as being disorienting to that category produces a dualism between what the students expect and what the trip provides. Although Bob acknowledges that he does not know the entry points of the students in any definitive way, the discourse he aligns himself with suggests otherwise, and his actions support a dualistic rendering between the enculturated human subject and the emancipatory nature of the types of trips he leads.

In order to see the students as having a singular background, Bob also reduces the diversity in society. Society becomes unitary with its emphasis on a mechanical notion of time, a dualistic splitting of the world, and a privileging of devices over things.

The discourse Bob employs creates boundaries around what it is to be human and what counts for nature. For Bob, nature is a place where emancipatory euphoria can occur. It is a place that is distinct from urban settings and has special qualities. Bob see most people as trapped in a world of mechanical time and surrounded by devices. Nature provides an experience that is qualitatively different. Bob's discourse suggests that people should try and re-member their relationship with the earth; that it is good to do so. This constructs nature as positive and urban settings as negative, which also prescribes the type of relationships that can surface. The students are not encouraged to explore the ways in which they might be connected to a city for example. Bob's discourse inscribes onto human subjects a goal: surface their relationship with the earth. In part the power of this discourse is to remake the human subject as a member of nature. Humans become part of nature, a part that has recently become falsely separated and unaware of its connection, and urban life has contributed to this separation.

Bob speaks of being surrounded by devices and locked into mechanical time, both of which are results of modern society and technology. Wise use of technology for Bob means not succumbing to the false idea that humans are unconnected from nature. Technology and modern society has misrepresented the human subject to itself as inherently separate from nature. Both deep ecology and Bob's discourse strive to break down this "false" barrier between the human subject and nature. The removal of the barrier is a move toward a unity between the human subject and nature that results in the move to the outside, which creates the totalized category of the earth. Humans become undifferentiated in some ways from the earth, and both are normalized or essentialized to

some degree.

Technology occupies a dangerous position in Bob's discourse. When technology becomes the yardstick for how close humans are to nature, then culture can be cast as unnatural. The fewer technological advances a society has, the less culture it has and, therefore, the closer it is to nature. Under this system, humans can lose the ability to playfully engage technology, to appropriate it for uses other than the destruction of nature. Unless specifically stated, the introduction of benign or 'nature friendly' technologies still disrupt nature. How, for example, can an outdoor leader use certain modern technological devices (i.e., cell phones, GPS, personal locator beacons) to enhance the quality or safety of the trip without detracting from the feelings of "roughing it" or of "remoteness?" Any human technological influence is dangerous to wilderness, because technology and wilderness have been constructed in some senses as opposites. Humanity is seen as having lost its original connection with nature through the promotion and development of society, culture, and technology. In promoting a re-membering of our original connection, what can count as beneficial aspects of technology becomes harder to see. There is a risk of turning to a nostalgic longing for simpler days and simpler means. The image of the noble savage holds a currency above that of the urban dweller, because it is without technology, and hence, closer to nature. This danger is one that Bob faces and recognizes. He is not anti-technology, yet he struggles with some of the implications of his discourse in this regard. While he is not against technology, he does see it as the main source for humanity's false separation from nature. Negotiating his concern with the ecological crisis (i.e., something must be done to

protect the earth) and how (or whether) to embrace technology seems to be an unresolved issue for Bob. This is a complex situation because, on the one hand, the issues that Bob feels are pressing in society today (i.e., air born toxins) are products of modern technology and ecological in nature. For example, Bob speaks of giving money to Friends of the Earth, a group that works to reduce air born toxins, in an effort to help prevent cancer. For Bob, technology has created these toxins and, hence, giving money to Friends of the Earth is one way to help address the problematic aspects of technology. There is another side to this issue. The very knowledge that air born toxins are linked to cancer is something that results from research and scientific study, which rests on the use of certain technological advents. In addition, Bob recognizes that his life is very dependent upon technology. He owns two cars; he uses the internet; he is an avid music fan and has a large collection of compact disks as well as a new stereo system. Many of the things that Bob values and the experiences he is able to enjoy are a direct result of technology. He does not wish people to turn their backs on technological development, and he himself is unable to live as he does without technology. Yet that same technological development has surrounded him (and others) with devices and entrenched him in mechanical notions of time–both ideas Bob resists.

Of course it is not as simple as to suggest that the discourse Bob employs only creates organic totals that reduce diversity and exercise hegemony over other views of what counts for nature and human beings. As Hanson (1996) says, discourse is the power to "extend visibility and legitimacy to a person as a political subject. On the other hand, it also functions normatively in language to both reveal and conceal, or distort that

which is true about the subject" (p. 6). Thus far, the analysis I have undertaken has focussed on how Bob's discourse has normalized nature as a certain subject and in the process has also normalized what humans are. There is another aspect of Bob's discourse–that of revealing a view of what nature and humans can be as distinct from the mainstream views of Western society. Bob's discourse can also be seen as an attempt to "promote the political visibility of nature and to seek representation for a subject that for too long was...either misrepresented or not represented at all" (Hanson, 1996, p. 13). The discourse Bob connects with does move to the outside and create total organic wholes, yet it also attempts to extend not only visibility, but also value, for nature and humans as subjects in a different way from what Bob perceives as the dominant view. At this level, Bob is engaged in a process of honouring and promoting a diversity and difference.

For Bob, one important aspect of distilling the relationship people have with the earth is allowing some freedom for this relationship to take different forms in people. Bob's discourse does restrict the relationship people can surface with the earth to those that are loving, appreciating, and caring, but beyond this, he places no restriction on it. Even though his discourse does prescribe certain types of values toward the land, there is still room for some manoeuvring. He would be equally happy with students who become advocates of wilderness areas and strive to protect them as he is with people who quietly value the earth and plant a garden in their backyard. Bob's discourse is more about creating culturally disorienting experiences, than producing wilderness advocates or supporters of a particular perspective. For example, he speaks of seeking out and

encouraging those students who are advocacy minded, but also of bringing in trappers to the class to speak about the value of trapping animals:

> Before the talk starts the students are distraught to hear that they are going to have such a talk because it is a foregone conclusion what their position is. After the talk, they are not so sure anymore, they have learned a little bit more. So it is all a little more disorienting than they thought, it is not as simple as they thought.

The students are also asked to keep a journal throughout the course, and based on their entries, Bob tries to encourage whatever type of relationship the students are developing with the earth. It might be advocacy; it might be learning to value a trapping lifestyle.

There is a tension in Bob's discourse around the issue of determining the type of relationship students surface with the earth. On the one hand, Bob discursively conditions the experiences students have on his trips, but he also attempts to leave open some of the specifics of that relationship. The difficulty is that by masking the constructed nature of all experiences, the discourse Bob aligns himself with attempts to position Bob in such a way that he loses much of the ability to promote or be open to alternative constructions. When human beings and nature are set out a priori as given categories, only certain relationships between them are possible. Bob's discourse is about helping the students surface their relationship with the earth. It is not possible to have an account of the world that is not a construction or that does not foreclose on alternatives. Bob's way of putting together the world does leave open some alternatives. He hopes that the students will discover the particular flavour of their own personal relationship with the earth. The

difficulty that arises when the constructed nature of our discourse is not engaged is two-fold. First, if a student attempted to mobilize a discourse that was significantly different from Bob's, there is a danger of either re-casting it in deep ecology terms or failing to recognize it as legitimate. Second, denying (at some level) the influences our construction of the world have on the ability of alternative constructions to surface is to reduce our ability to both support alternatives and to work toward including those alternatives in our courses, trips, and writings.

Discourse as Resistance–Experiential Education

Power is something that constantly circulates through discourse. It is not distributed evenly or democratically, but nonetheless it moves through all discourses (Hanson, 1996). Power has more than just a prohibitive effect; it also has productive aspects. As Hanson states, "Foucault argued that 'what makes power hold good, what makes it accepted, is simply the fact that it doesn't only weigh on us as a force that says no, but that it traverses and produces things, it induces pleasure, forms knowledge, produces discourses' (1979, p.119)" (p. 5). If knowledge is productive, it is the production of alternative knowledge that can give power its resistive quality. Knowledge can be created that resists dominant notions of the world and extends legitimacy to subjects in various distinct ways. Bob's discourse can be seen as resistive in this light. Bob is creating knowledge about nature and humans in the midst of larger forces and discourses. Thus far, this analysis has stayed within Bob's discourse, critiquing it as if it stood only in relation to deep ecology and was independent of other, larger forces and

discourses in Western society. While this is a valid reading in the sense that it shows some of the implications of how power is deployed, there are other viewpoints from which to read Bob's discourse.

Bob is a tenured professor at a Canadian university. There are many forces and patterns that Bob is subject to in such a world. By situating Bob in a university, we can begin to see how he constructs an experience and a discourse that resists some of these forces and patterns. One of the patterns that Bob resists is the idea of testing. He speaks about the continual struggle he faces from other academics when asked about his courses. Bob says he feels a constant need to justify to the university what he does and how he marks his students. He says he has had an interesting time trying to negotiate the evaluation of his courses, because he feels testing is not the best means to evaluate his students, while other faculty did. "Interesting" is probably an understatement. Bob's discourse on experiential education is resistive of notions that knowledge is something that can passed from an instructor to a student and then tested. Traditional education, Bob feels, has not been experiential. In this light Bob is going against the grain; his discourse is subversive in that it posits alternatives to the mainstream educational discourse. Going against the grain of more dominant discourses means Bob faces issues such as explaining how he evaluates the "really great positive sweeping time" that he hopes the students will have on his trips. These experiences that Bob hopes the students will have are connected to the culturally disorienting atmosphere he is creating; they are key experiences for Bob in determining whether a student is beginning to make the shift to a new way of knowing and being in the world. They are experiences of emanipatory

euphoria and need to be evaluated at some level, but what kind of test does one make for this sort of experience? Certainly the standard fair of multiple choice exams would not capture the type of learning Bob strives for, yet this is the larger discursive pressure he faces. The issue of examining and testing is one that Bob faces regularly:

> it happens all the time in our field…you teach a programme experientially, and try to create...community in your classroom and then you fall back into the pitfalls of evaluating it...with a midterm and a final because you have to differentiate the grades. Well, then what happens is you remove yourself, because your curriculum will always be secondary in the minds of students to the evaluation, and so...you have to start with evaluation because the crux...is evaluation. So if you want to run a class...experientially where you create a classroom community that is different from the norm, you can't evaluate it by the norm. I've done a little bit of writing about evaluation. I've done some talks at conferences on evaluation, and...[on] this idea that if you want to teach alternatively, you've got to evaluate alternatively.

The larger discourse of what is acceptable and even required in a university course threatens to pull Bob into forms of evaluation (tests, midterms, and finals) that he otherwise would avoid. It takes strength to embody an alternative discourse within a more dominant one, and Bob struggles with this issue regularly.

In creating a culturally challenging and disorienting experience that seeks to

question some of the basic educational assumptions of Western society, Bob places himself outside the mainstream discourse of what university and knowledge is. Having people sit around a campfire at night, singing songs and telling jokes, seems very different from sitting in a classroom taking notes; yet there is valuable learning taking place. Bob recognizes this and states overtly "the more the camp isn't like school in the city the better."

Alternative methods are the norm in Bob's courses. For example, sometimes he has the students create the readings as they progress through the course, basing the course around what intrigues and motivates the students. He speaks of creating the passion first, and then moving to supply the information second. Rather than fill their heads with technical knowledge, Bob offers an experience to engage the students and then lets them decide what to focus on. He wants the students to feel connected to the learning and so lets them decide where they want to go. He assigns journals while on the trip and uses these to provide the basis for the assignments later in the course. Based on where the students feel drawn to, he asks them to research a topic and present it (often experientially) to the class. Examples of this include students who have learned to make snowshoes and brought in some of their creations or have developed a character such as a Voyageur and enacted an historical event. Letting the students choose what they are interested in is in keeping with Bob's philosophy of what experiential education is. He says, "I don't say [to the students] you've got to be tested on it...You've got to reproduced exactly what I thought...You've got to value it. I just throw it into the atmosphere."

Not only does Bob face the issue of how he conducts his courses in relation to the academic world, he also faces it within the practical field of outdoor education. In one instance he speaks of creating a space for people to just "be" with nature, of spending quite time at night just looking around. It is a very unstructured time that not all outdoor educators see the value in:

> I've been out with other educators [who say], "Well this seems like a waste of time, you didn't use this space." And I go, "No, this space is critical, this is space with night." Another kind of educator might say, "No we could use this session to talk about what's the best jackknife you've used, everybody could do a special little session, and we could fill that space." And I'm saying...we're missing the space that's really there, which is what evolves naturally in a beautiful evening. Hopefully its story telling; it could be just play; it could a long back rubbing session; it could be just everybody stargazing, but those aren't wasted times, those are key pedagogical moments.

For Bob, key pedagogical moments can be quite different than in traditional education. Part of the reason for this is what Bob perceives as the entry points of his students[10]. For years Bob has been leading trips and teaching outdoor education. Over the years he has been observing how students react to being out in nature, and he feels that he has a fairly

---

[10] While entry points have already been discussed as totalizing, this is not to say that there are no good points to Bob's use of them. Following Orlie (1997), there can be multiple outcomes from any action or discursive element, and entry points are no different; they do both benefit and harm.

good idea of the entry points of most of them. Based on this entry point, Bob tries to create an atmosphere that is culturally disorienting for the students. The way Bob's discourse puts together the world seems to resonate with most students. Bob tells me that many students do find what he is trying to accomplish on the trip disorienting; they find that Bob is asking them to step outside their habitual ways of being in and relating to the world. The deep ecological aspects of the discourse that Bob engages in constructs the habitual epistemological and ontological ways of the students as relating to nature as if humans were separate from nature. From this Bob deduces that he is creating an alternative to the dominant view in Western culture–an alternative that is centred around experiential models of education. For example, traditionally in ecology, students would study about nature and learn the names of species and how various elements of an ecosystem interact and interrelate. In wanting to create a disorienting and challenging experience, Bob resists notions of learning about nature as an unconnected object or dispassionately. He wants students to learn the names of plant species, not because they feel they have to in order to pass his course, but because they feel drawn to do so. Teaching should stir the passions first. In a conference presentation to teachers, Bob refers to Alfred North Whitehead's idea of education as being concerned with the creation of romance first, then moving to precision, and finally to generalization. This discourse of education suggests that educators should intrigue students first, then provide the details, and follow that with general principles. Bob explains that the dominant model for educators goes the other direction. Students come to class and learn the taxonomy system of plants first, then the specifics of each one, and then perhaps they become interested,

although this last step is not required. Under this dominant model of education, the uninterested student can fair as well as the engaged one. Bob resists this construction and prefers to begin with the romance. He first gets students interested, and when they come to him asking for more information, he directs them to the knowledge they seek. From the engagement comes the spark to learn more. Students who travel by canoe for five days may develop the desire to learn more about the design and history of canoeing. Bob takes this desire and focuses it toward a presentation in which that student would research and possibly learn to make a canoe or paddle for the class. From the romance comes the motivation to move to precision, which can lead to discussion on the generalization of learning. This approach is different from what many students are accustomed to in university and is an expression of a non-dominant discourse about education.

Aside from creating a totality based on a distinction between what humans and the earth are, Bob's emphasis on re-connecting with the earth is a view that does seem to be foreign to many of the students he teaches. There is a resistive quality to Bob's belief that humans are connected to the earth and that we have removed ourselves from an awareness of this. Bob indicates that many of his students find the trip uncomfortable, because they are unaccustomed to this lifestyle. The idea of having to go to the washroom in the bush or using an outhouse are aspects that most are unfamiliar with. Bob challenges the students to try a different lifestyle from what they are used to. He tries to present an alternative to what most people are accustomed to and encounters resistence on the part of some students. When viewed from this perspective, Bob's discourse can be read as promoting an alternative, not only to what traditional education is, but also to the

dominant way people in Western society relate to the world.

Bob relates a story of a canvasser coming to his door asking for money for cancer research. Bob's response was that he already does give money–he donates to Friends of the Earth who are fighting air-born toxins–and the canvasser does not see the connection. This lack of connection, for Bob, is devastating. In Bob's view, we produce a toxin, we breathe a toxin, we become a toxin. The canvasser's lack of understanding of the connection Bob was making is evidence for Bob that modern society has become so removed from the earth that connections between cancer and environmental groups are difficult to see. Bob suggests "we dupe ourselves...[by] thinking that...these things aren't really there, or we haven't internalized them, or we don't live them in a deep knowing kind of way, so we objectify the world and so these things aren't real." Bob creates and supports a discourse that fights the notion that things are unconnected. He sees ourselves as connected in many ways to the earth, and this view places him outside much of the dominant way of conceptualizing the world.

Bob's views on what education can be, on the ecological crisis, and how Western culture is duping people into seeing themselves apart from nature have ramifications beyond the leading of the trip. As a professor at a university, Bob faces the daily challenge of living and working in a world that he sees does not value body time. He finds it very difficult to walk the talk of embodying an alternative epistemological way of being with nature when in the city and immersed in his job. "So…[it] becomes not the easiest thing in the world when you get really busy in your job and you're advocating body time and here's something [your job] that...puts you in mechanical time, so you see the

pitfalls...you certainly don't go home and close your door on your job, it's a lifestyle." The sharp division between work and the rest of life does not hold true for Bob. What he engages in in his classes is not something unconnected from his life–it is his lifestyle. As an example, Bob connects issues such as riding his bike to work with an internalization of the concept of ecological crisis. If he truly believes there is an ecological crisis today, then it is not something he can turn on only in his classrooms. His lifestyle reflects this embedded notion of who he is, what his responsibilities are, how he should be teaching, and how he should lead his life. Yet the discourse Bob supports is subordinate to the mainstream discourse concerning how people should relate to the world, and this contributes to Bob feeling like he is engaged in an uphill battle to have his discourse understood and accepted by society and in academic circles.

The struggles Bob encounters illustrate some of the ways his discourse is at odds with the more mainstream elements in society. His discourse is an attempt to move people, to challenge the status quo. Bob's positioning of Western society as categorizing humans and nature as unconnected does have some issues related to a will to totality and a reduction of diversity, yet it also, when placed against the perceived entry points of his students and the pressures of working in an academic setting, has qualities of opening up space for a different type of relationship to emerge.

According to van Wyck (1997), traditionally environmetnalisms have viewed nature as the silent, mute partner that culture seeks to use to increase its material wealth through selective commodification. Now environmentalisms are slowly reversing the valencies of this dualism. Instead of nature as other, culture becomes other. "The

ecological self, the self we would apparently encounter on the path not taken by contemporary Western society, becomes more than an authentic conduit for nature, it *becomes* nature (van Wyck, 1997, p. 77). Environmentalisms, such as deep ecology, create an alternative for viewing nature and human beings where nature becomes the positive element. Bob's discourse endorses this alternative view. Nature becomes something positive, and culture is seen as harmful to the world. There are some inherent difficulties in reversing the valencies of this dualism without challenging the very root of the dualistic view of the world, yet even so, Bob is addressing what he sees as a fundamental problem in the world, and it is hard to ignore the claim that the earth is undergoing some grievous damage from modern society. Certainly Bob feels this. He says that he has really internalized the notion of an ecological crisis, and this motivates much of what he does both in the classroom and beyond. In so doing, Bob supports a discourse that creates an alternative, that challenges people, that disorients them and encourages us to re-think how we exist in the world.

Leo's Discourse

Even though Leo does not profess to be a deep ecologist as Bob does, the same type of critical analysis that was used with Bob can also be applied to Leo. Leo's discourse on environmental ethics also creates boundaries around what nature is, and suggests what good behaviour toward nature should be. Leo, like Bob, is also engaged in other discursive fields that he must negotiate through. In addition to any similarities, there are some differences that will be highlighted as the analysis proceeds.

The Land Ethic and Ecology

While one element in Bob's discourse moved to the outside by positing an organic unity of the whole earth, one of the elements in Leo's discourse creates biotic communities and ecosystems. Leo uses a particular discourse in ecology as a tool to describe nature. Ecology, as a science, has much in common with the rationalities of other sciences. It appeals to the scientific method, Cartesian rationality, and constructs certain structures around and through which truth and legitimacy are extended onto the natural world. Van Wyck (1997) points out that "there is a near universal assumption within environmentalism that scientific ecology provides both a real model of how the world actually is, and a prescriptive model of how we as humans ought to fit in...and (therefore) legitimates various political, ideological, and moral positions with respect to the world" (p. 48).

Ecology offers up a very potent set of metaphors with which to speak about the world: the earth as a spaceship, or trees forming the lungs of the planet by providing oxygen, or marshes and wetlands being likened to kidneys due to their filtering effect. All of these metaphors have proved very potent in environmental circles. Part of their potency derives from their embeddedness in Western rational thought. (The scientific method and rational thought are two very powerful trends in the Euro-North American epistemological tradition, and ecology appeals to both.) An important distinction should be made between environmental thought and ecology: Ecology claims to present what *is* in the world, not what *ought* to be, while environmental thought is a moral stance with respect to the proper treatment of nature. To the degree that environmental thought

suggests an "ought" from ecology's "is", it steps beyond the boundaries of ecological thought.

This is what often happens; environmental discourse suggests proper ways of being in the world and grounds these claims quite often in one or another type of ecological discourse. Environmental thought often uses ecology as "a device that, on the one hand, has the ability to claim the authority of sameness with science; this would be the claim to legitimation. On the other hand, it simultaneously asserts its difference from science; a difference that founds and supports its 'ethical accomplishment'" (van Wyck, 1997, p. 50). In this way, environmental discourse steps beyond ecological discourse. Ecological insights often rest as axioms for environmental thought, yet these same axioms have become stripped of their discursive specificity, their "locatedness" in ecological thought. They become free floating normative concepts with the stamp of scientific approval.

While ecology offers little or no critique of the social order that produces it, environmentalism often does. Environmental ethics that turn to ecology (i.e., the land ethic or ecosystems rights) suggest that because ecosystems 'exist,' humanity can discover what is good for them, and from that determine what good human behaviour is. As a social and historical product, ecology is located in modern science and rational, Cartesian discursive fields. Ecology contains within it vestiges of power structures and patterns that permeate modern Western society. Like all discourses, ecology has an agenda; it enables certain things and conceals others. Environmentalisms that turn to ecology have not spent much time uncovering the ways in which ecology itself, and by extension, much of

environmental thought, is located, has an agenda, and functions to extend legitimacy onto the world (van Wyck, 1997).

Discourses of environmentalism that rely on ecology often emphasize the importance of ecological balance and integrity. That ecosystems seek homeostasis is a claim in ecology of what exists in the world. That homeostasis is good and should be encouraged or supported is a moral claim in environmental ethics such as the land ethic. An emphasis on ecosystem homeostasis gives legitimacy and validity to concepts like balance, stability, and integrity over concepts like competition, fluctuation, and change. The land ethic and other similar discourses exclude concepts that appear antithetical to the functioning of homeostatic systems. Furthermore, by giving an epistemological privilege to systems that strive for equilibrium, the land ethic has less ability to examine alternative models, competing frameworks, or complimentary schemas. This becomes more potent when one realizes that often environmental thought positions itself in a paratheoretical stance with respect to science.

A paratheroetical stance is one in which any argument that contradicts a theory becomes further fuel for the theory. Environmental discourses such as the land ethic can be paratheoretical in as much as claims to use other models and theories to view the world are discredited as "unscientific" while any scientific claim contrary to the aims of environmental thought is cast as "immoral." Because ecologically grounded environmental ethics claim both legitimation from and a move beyond science, scientific critiques of environmental thought serve to strengthen the claim that environmental thought has moved beyond science. Non-scientific claims, because they cannot deploy the "correct"

cultural capital (i.e., scientific discourse), become irrational, unscientific, or wrong, and their ability to manoeuver within the field of environmental discourse is curtailed and circumscribed. For example, environmental groups and developers in Banff National Park both use ecological discourse in their debates (Hanson, 1996). In cases where there is disagreement between developers and environmental groups, the environmentalists can argue either the developers do not have a grounding in a morally solid position or they are unscientific. Any study of ecological impacts of particular developments simply provide data to be used by either side of the debate. Environmental groups take those data and suggest any view that uses the same data to support development instead of preservation is not constructing the correct "ought" from the ecological "is" (i.e., is immoral). On the other hand, views that suggest development is good yet do not couch the answer in ecological language can be positioned by environmental groups as unecological. In essence, any pro-development view that lacks an ecological grounding becomes invalid, because to promote development with no understanding of the ecological impacts is foolish. In either case (ecologically grounded support for development or a different ideological support), both views that promote development re-enforce ecologically grounded environmental thought's hold on the Truth.

The Demand of Minimum Impact

Within discourses like the land ethic, human agency has inscribed onto it a goal: behave in ways beneficial for ecosystems. Humans should try and preserve the integrity, stability, and beauty of ecosystems. Within outdoor recreation, one of the main ways to

achieve such a goal is through minimum impact practices. Minimum impact practices rest on the assumption that once ecology has determined how ecosystems function, environmental thought can prescribe the correct behaviour for humans to ensure the continuation of those ecosystems. Preserving stability, integrity, beauty, and harmony becomes a moral order for humans within the land ethic discourse.

Humans now have a unified goal, and from this perspective are reduced to a single category with respect to ecosystems. Minimum impact ideology rests on the notion that humans are essentially the same: we are all potentially dangerous to ecosystems. If human action was constructed as a normal function of the system, then the parameters of that system is would change to incorporate human action and behaviour. For example, human creations such as cities could be included in the definition of ecosystems and not seen as antithetical to wilderness ecosystems and areas. When humans are positioned as outsiders to the ecosystem, however, we need to be careful of our impacts. One result of this definition of human action is minimum impact practices, which attempt to regulate the damage of human action to tolerable levels.

A reading of the discourse of the land ethic, such as the one I have outlined, that casts cities as outside of ecosystems, and hence unnatural, is not to suggest we see all human action as natural. This too is a political move and posits another totalistic rendering of the world. As Lyotard reminds us, we fall into the trap of replacing modernity with a re-named version of itself when we respond "*to the demand of the vanquished theory*, and the demand is: put something in my place. The important thing is this place, however, not the contents of the theory. It is the place of [totalizing] theory that must be vanquished"

(quoted in van Wyck, 1997, p. 72). Instead of swinging from one totalized view (all human action is unnatural) to another (all human action is natural), I am resisting constructions of the world that are normalizing. All views are constructed, yet not all need be totalizing. All environmental discourses are political and have agendas, but when they posit totalized views of the world, as in the land ethic's ecosystem integrity, they lose the ability to recognize the constructed nature of their world. There is no inherent, ontologically absolute reason for excluding (or including) cities from ecosystems (anymore than there is for constructing ecosystems from which humans can be included or excluded), other than a preference[11] toward such a construction. There are no innocent, powerless constructions of the world, and the land ethic, by grounding its discourse in a totalizing ontological phenomenalism, obscures the discursive nature of the power circulating through its discourse. The power of such totalizing discourses is the ability they have to construct themselves as if they could accurately reflect the world, not actively construct it.

What gives ecological discourse like the land ethic its force in society (and contributes to its inability to see how it mobilizes power) is a conventional level of discursive agreement that constructs an inherent connection between ecological symbols and their referents. The force and pervasiveness with which society constructs ecology as Truth gives ecology a powerful discursive presence, a certain solidness of being connected

---

[11] Preference here refers to more than a single person's wants and desires. Preference refers to both the individual level, but also the historical and societal forces (conventional level) that shape our individual perspectives. There are historical and social reasons why certain totalizing views of the world have been constructed.

to ontological absolutism. There is widespread agreement in modern Western society on the power of science to convey an accurate picture of the world. This agreement creates a conventional level of reality; people act as if ecology is really depicting the world and the effect of this agreement is that ecology has the power to appear to do so. Given this conventional power of ecology to construct homeomorphic relations between theory and reality, the moral prescriptions of ethical frameworks like the land ethic take on additional force.

The Panoptic Gaze

The conventional force of ecologically grounded environmental discourse places human agency under a pervasive gaze. A gaze that is internalized. A gaze that subtly, but powerfully, suggests to everyone to behave in certain ways with respect to the environment. Human beings begin to self-regulate themselves toward ecological friendly behaviour. A panoptic power structure is established such that humans are surveyed and controlled by their own agency. This panopticon is a purely administrative structure whose aim is to integrate the human being into the ecological world. This gaze originates from a transcendental point that is logically, morally, and of administrative necessity, beyond the world. It is a gaze that drops a schematic plan over on top of the world and, hence, needs to exist beyond the world. It is not a physical structure, but rather a diagram of a mechanism or a schema of power. The human self becomes the internal regulator or police of the panopticon. We self discipline ourselves toward compliance with the panoptic strictures (see Foucault, 1977, and van Wyck, 1997).

Mobilization of this panoptic structure can be seen in Leo's trip. By the end of the trip, Leo says he no longer needs to ask the students to follow minimum impact practices, because his directive leadership approach has enforced these practices enough at the start; now he lets "people pick up those responsibilities and practice them and *kind of internalize that on their own*"(emphasis added). This is a discourse that enacts a panoptic gaze on the students, which moves them to become administrators of the minimum impact regulations on their own. This discourse suggests that the students will believe that what they are doing is good for the land and will alter their behaviour to fall in line with the prescripts of minimum impact practices. Leo's task on wilderness trips is not to convince people of the reality of ecosystems; this is already given in modern society. Leo's task is to convince people of the value of wilderness and ecosystems and establish a grounding in minimum impact practices as an expression of the value people have for wilderness. Leo states one of his goals quite clearly: "to create disciples that will want to protect it [biotic communities and ecosystems]." It is the tendency, in modern society, to construct totalizing accounts that has inscribed onto people the validity and reality of ecosystems and of science's ability to understand them. It is the power of the panopticon that disciplines the human subject into conforming to such a construction. Leo's job of teaching minimum impact practices becomes that much easier, because his students already buy into the idea that ecology is correct, and we should be following any environmentalism that extends an ecologically grounded moral "ought."

Of Humans and Nature

The discourse that Leo is engaged in is also a negotiation of what human and nature mean. Leo speaks of nature as being biotic communities and natural communities and places less emphasis on urban communities. He tells me that although he is concerned with urban nature (i.e., parks inside a city), he is not as concerned with this type of nature as he is with spaces that are outside the urban landscape. While he recycles and does all the things that he thinks someone concerned for the environment would do, he is "more willing to spend time and energy in trying to maintain that [wilderness outside urban space] than [he is] in getting involved in urban environmental issues." Leo's discourse sets up a division between what is urban and what is wilderness and places a value for each side of the dualism. Like Bob's discourse, Leo's has a valency for each end of the dualistic split between urban and wilderness (wilderness becomes positive and restorative, while urban space becomes that space we need to escape from in order to be restored).

Running through Leo's discourse there seems to be two different threads concerning the value of wilderness and humans' place in it. At one point Leo engages in a construction of wilderness as positive and down plays the value of urban environments. He says that he is concerned with urban space only to the extent that he has to live in it, but his passion is really for the places that bring forth feelings of awe and majesty. He speaks of all the negative elements he sees in a city (i.e., crime, pollution, fast pace), and says that this is why he chooses to live twenty-six miles outside the city: "The reason that I live where I do is because I don't like living in real congested in urban areas. It drive me completely crazy. I don't like living where I hear the constant hum of traffic." He still

recycles and tries to be careful of his impacts when at home or work, but, as he says, "I've chosen particularly just to concentrate on wilderness and more of the natural kinds of areas for things that I do or don't do."

Another example of the emphasis Leo has on wilderness areas is the courses he teaches at university. One of these is a wilderness course in which Leo teaches the students about the value of wilderness hoping "to make wilderness lovers out of them....[He hopes] that they will be interested in wilderness, that they will see its value, that they will become active in its preservation." Leo is very clear with the perspective this course is taking. He tells the students at the start of the course that it is not a balanced approach, and if they are looking for a balanced view, they should take a different course. This course does not talk about the economic loss when a particular area gets nominated as wilderness; it only considers the value of having the wilderness area.

For Leo, this pro-wilderness course is valuable for the students, because they get the other side of the issue all the time in different courses. Courses in economics and forestry do not present a balanced view; yet this is hardly mentioned. Leo is hoping to balance the scales by providing an alternative to the mainstream approach to land use and management. In this way Leo is working against what he perceives as the dominant discourse by providing an alternative for students. This alternative is one way Leo engenders a site of resistence. Both Bob and Leo are working with discourses that are not mainstream or dominant and are trying to promote alternative ways to think about and value the land.

Leo recognizes that he makes a sharp division between wilderness and urban

areas, overtly states so, and then opposes this position to that of the mainstream discourse. Because Leo is aware of both his own and the mainstream discourse, he is able to construct the wilderness course in such a way as to promote a view of humans' place in wilderness that is an alternative to what most students receive in other courses. Leo's emphasis on the land ethic and the value he sees in wilderness areas lead him to create courses like the wilderness course, but because he recognizes it as an unbalanced view, he offers another course that is more balanced–the outdoor education course.

In the outdoor education course, students discuss not only the value of wilderness areas but also the importance of these areas for natural resources. He gives an example of wanting to protect a marsh ecosystem, and in the wilderness course he would be all for protection, but in the outdoor education course he says that if building a factory on that land will bring in five thousand jobs–"to hell with the marsh." Leo's discourse is not a simple formulae of wilderness always being positive and winning out over concerns of the city. Certainly the main trend in Leo's discourse is that wilderness is a special place and he needs to do everything he can to protect, but this does not negate that there are pressing concerns in cities.

Know Thyself: The Discourse of the Masterful Subject[12]

Whether the discourse that Leo employs supports wilderness over urban space or urban concerns over wilderness ones, it rests on the notion of a masterful, rational, knowing subject. There is a certainty in the position Leo takes that works to deny the constructed nature of discourse. The discourse on the land ethic that Leo employs does not reflect the Truth of what is actually there in the world; it creates the world around us in a certain way. The kind of tentativeness that comes from a recognition of the power of discourse to create the world is missing from the land ethic discourse. The land ethic rests on the idea that through ecology, humans are able to capture the world in an accurate fashion, which makes the human subject (as the creator and controller of the science of ecology) rational, knowing, and masterful. To use a science founded on rational thought, humans must be capable of being rational as well. In addition to casting ecology as the device through which an accurate picture of the natural world is taken, the land ethic also paints a picture of the human subject as rational and knowing. By casting nature as not human, we learn more about what it is to be human. The picture we get of what it means to be human is also cast as an accurate one–if humans can paint an accurate picture of what the world is, then we also paint an accurate picture of who we are as part of that world.

---

[12] It should be noted that the masterful subject referred to pertains mainly to Western, Euro-North American subjects. The effects of culture and varying access to technology around the world adds another level of consideration not undertaken. As both Bob and Leo confine their discourse to a mainly North American venue, a restriction of the analysis of that discourse to Euro-North American culture is also required. Although it would likely prove insightful to add the element of cultural appropriateness to the analysis, this remains another project for another day.

It is through a centred, rational, knowing subject that definitive, ontologically privileged knowledge about the world arises. For example, the land ethic helps to create the very categories of "marsh" and "factory" as examples of ecosystems and human endeavours that are opposed to each other. Because of the way Leo employs the land ethic, his choices are more pre-determined as either support for the factory or support for the marsh. There is a privileging of the created categories and particular constructions of the world, and it becomes difficult to remain tentative about the historical, social, and cultural forces influencing those constructions, or the effects those constructions have on available actions and choices in the world.

Conley (1997) suggests that the full masterful subject is anachronistic because of the long process of decentring that has taken place through the failure of rationalism and discoveries in both sciences and humanities of complex systems with no final solutions. Some ecological thinkers today "declare that humans have no claim to strive toward a privileged position in the universe" (Conley, 1997, p. 16). By basing its knowledge claims on a rational and centred subject with access to ontological certainty, the land ethic positions humans in a privileged position within the universe. Furthermore, what we can know about ourselves becomes privileged knowledge that reflects what there actually is to know. If, on the other hand, knowledge about the world and ourselves is discursively created and is seen as an attempt to extend the legitimacy of certain configurations of the world, then one is lead to question what it is we think we know about ourselves, and even what is the "we" that we think we know. If the lines around humans and nature are constantly negotiated, and each are attempts at promoting a certain construction, then

how we define ourselves and how we know ourselves also comes into question. It is probably inevitable that humans seek to understand themselves, draw boundaries around what it means to be human, and hence exclude what is not human. When these boundaries are reified and presumed to exist as a given that scientific thought can uncover, we lose the ability to ask how these boundaries were created, for what end, or to re-create them in new ways. With ontologically privileged knowledge about the world, it becomes hard to investigate what boundaries where created in an attempt to better understand how power was used as an exercise at convincing people of a certain construction of the world, because the boundaries are not seen as political. They simply represent what is "out there" in the world. The land ethic does not engage in investigations of how the borderlines it paints were fabricated, because, according to the land ethic, there is no painter, the lines already exist and are just being uncovered.

Instead of seeing the human self as masterful and rational and nature as stable, a discursive analysis can suggest that nature is radically unstable, open for definition, and furthermore, the definitions chosen are politically motivated. As Conley (1997) says,

> atoms collide by chance and form networks that cannot be entirely controlled. Henceforth, no human order, no natural order, is legitimate. Every configuration is but a temporary order that comes out of disorder. Anything that justifies itself does so by decree. No discourse is lasting or legitimate (p.72).

A recognition that it is power that decrees the existing order into being has various consequences. It can lead to a hopelessness, because there is no longer a certainty of

action or a firmness of belief that comes with ontological phenomenalism. We might ask ourselves: Why try to understand our place in the world if the only place is whatever we create? What does it matter, then, how we define ourselves and nature? Power, though, does have effects, and to say that the land ethic is discursively created, is not to say that it mobilizes power without pattern or reason. The discourse of the land ethic does enable certain things and eases others out of currency. When Leo speaks of the biotic community as being more important to him than natural elements within a city, there are consequences. In order to understand these consequences, we need to examine our discourses with the understanding that they are created and political before we can begin to see the effects they have and work to change those effects if we wish to. This is the other benefit of decentring the masterful human subject. The future now becomes something of near infinite possibility. It becomes a future not of a stable reality awaiting discovery, but one of becoming, where discourses create the world we live in. We no longer think of ourselves as "self-willed, conscious subjects with projects, or subjects endowed with stable identities and well-established customs, that is as citizens in the fold of a world that we believe had been made for us" (Conley, 1997, p.72). We now have the freedom to re-conceive ourselves in new ways and to ask ourselves not only who we are, but how we should be relating to an equally unstable nature. Unstable to the point that even the distinctions between nature and human are questioned in the image of the cyborg.

Hope and the Cyborg

Controlling boundary lines and border conditions is an exercise of power. How information crosses these lines, the rate, flow and direction of that information is an important aspect of power. When the lines surrounding human and nature are negotiated, information and knowledge is steered in certain directions with a certain force. A discussion of power in this context has more to do with the rate and flow of knowledge and information than with the integrity of the boundaries that are created (Haraway, 1991). The boundaries are only perceived of as having a level of integrity based on exercises of power that permit certain information across the boundaries, and resist certain other information's passing through. The discourse of the land ethic that rests on notions of ecology, which in turn rest on rational scientific method and thought, exercises power to make stable the boundaries between humans and nature in a particular configuration. That these boundaries are seen as stable (i.e., an ecosystem is seen as that which ecology claims it is) is a testament to the power of the discourse to fix meanings in stable constellations and direct the flow of information across the boundaries. For instance, within the land ethic it becomes harder to open channels to discuss the importance of individual elements in an ecosystem, because the force of the border control is such that only self-regulating systems are seen as having discursive capital. A form of bio-ideo-colonialism is exercised that favours systems over individuals. The outside, in the form of an ecosystem, gets privileged, while the contours of the inside, relations between individual elements in a system, are down-played. Differences between categories take precedence over differences within the categories. Difference within that threatens to

stretch the categories beyond recognition or usefulness is muted to the point of being silent. Questions of whether humans can meaningfully be classified as distinct from wilderness or what wilderness as opposed to society is did not enter into Leo's use of the discourse on minimum impact practices. This might be due to the influence that some of the streams in the land ethic discursive field exert on Leo. There is an assumed stability, in much of the land ethic discursive field, of the categories of human and wilderness that leaves minimum impact supporters discussing the various factors affecting the wilderness and the complications of trying to understand and measure all of the conditions and variables, but not what the effects are of constructing the category of wilderness as they have.

The discourse of the land ethic presupposes and reifies not only the division between human and nature, but also the constellations of "human" and "nature" that are then divided. This is a division that restricts the flow of any information or knowledge that might question whether or how humans and nature are separate, or suggest that distinctions between humans (i.e., cultural, gender, or class differences) might be more important than intra-categorical differences (i.e., between the categories of human and nature), or challenge the universality of the division between humans and wilderness.

When the human subject is decentred and a certain tentativeness and playfulness is introduced into theory, we can begin to question some of the very foundations of our knowledge. The image of the cyborg is a discursive construction of the world that suggests dualistic renderings are problematic; the cyborg image works prior to distinctions and dualisms. The cyborg image does not posit, for example, human and machine and a

combination of the two as possible categories. Instead, it questions the foundations of such categories in the first place. If none of them exist as stable units to begin with, how can they be meaningfully combined in only those three permutations? Cyborg imagery doesn't so much blur the boundary between humans and machines (or human and nature or physical and non-physical) as it blurs the ability to make such distinctions in the first place. The creation of the categories "human" and "wilderness" and a boundary between them is not impossible, but this boundary does not reflect what is really there; its creation is a political action laced with power.

Leo uses a discourse that creates the divisions of human and nature, human and machine (or technology), and human and non-human. The discourse of the land ethic works to control information flow around and across these lines. For example, one outgrowth of the land ethic is an alignment of technology with the city and a casting of wilderness areas as areas in which humans must attempt to minimize their impacts. Not leaving behind any packaging from food, walking lightly with hiking boots to reduce trampling effects on soil conditions, or the use of stove to alleviate the impacts that fires have are attempts to protect a certain construction of wilderness areas from what are seen as the damaging effects of technology. The use of global positioning systems to locate oneself anywhere also becomes a dangerous type of technology that can be seen as antithetical to the notion of wilderness as a place with little human activity and influence. In this respect, Leo has written on no rescue wilderness areas and the image of the wilderness as a frontier that provides a challenge for people. Under these definitions, wilderness is compromised when technology is allowed to invade it past a point. When

wilderness is seen as a place of remoteness and difficult access, knowing that you have a cell phone available to call help at any moment or a GPS to pinpoint your location within a few metres, takes away from feelings of remoteness and risk. The cell phone and GPS threaten a concept of wilderness that the land ethic promotes.

Cyborg imagery would question the very grounding for creating wilderness, humans, and technology as the land ethic does. How can we know, with a certainty that forecloses on alternatives, where humans end and wilderness begins? What is the dividing line? The closer one looks, the less clear the line becomes. The human subject has inscribed on it the imprint of technology so deeply that to remove technology is to alter who we are at a very deep level. Ironically, the very way that land ethic supporters (and some other environmentalists) conceptualize the earth is based on that same dangerous technology. It was the advent of space flight that gave rise to the image of the earth from space–the idea of one planet, one life support system. Now when students are asked by Leo to take time by themselves over lunch to acquaint themselves with the earth and the place they are in, they have access to this powerful image. Technology has inscribed so deeply onto our psyche the picture of a blue-green planet floating in space that we take for granted its reality and our place on it. Yet none of the students have seen or likely will see the planet from space. Moreover, the creation of the metaphor of a spaceship from the picture of earth as seen from space remains a political move with ramifications not a neutral construction from a Reality independent of human endeavour. The power of technology to deeply inscribe onto the human subject the idea that the metaphor of the spaceship earth exists is an example of how intertwined technology and humans are. There

is a powerful production of the human subject as crew member of the spaceship earth. Who we think we are and how we feel we should relate to other crew members are produced values and conceptions that are in part conditioned by technology's control of the flow and direction of information across boundaries. To ask what kind of ecological selves we could create without the image of the spaceship earth is not just an academic exercise. Re-configuring how technology affects our self-perception (or embracing its effects on us already) could have profound effects on our discourses about who we are, what nature is, the place of technology in the wilderness, and even the stability of such categories in the first place.

The Land Ethic as an Embedded Discourse

Like Bob's discourse, Leo's can also be seen in a broader context. As a member of a university community for over twenty-five years, Leo is subject to various other discourses, all of which exercise power to create various categories and constructions of the world. For example, the general discourse of outdoor recreation and land management has certain trends and ideas of what acceptable knowledge is. As a member of such a community and discourse, Leo needs to write and speak along certain lines to gain and maintain status. The majority of Leo's publications stay within the bounds of this discourse; if they did not, he might have a difficult time publishing or reaching a practitioner audience.

There are, however, some notable exceptions to this. One publication, discussed in Chapter Two, outlines an ethical framework for park and recreation practitioners in the

form of a "worth ethic" (Dustin. McAvoy, and Schultz, 1995). The worth ethic and Leo's ventures into more philosophical journals to examine differing frameworks for conceptualizing nature are examples of discourses the Leo supports and helps create that depart from the more dominant discourses in outdoor recreation (i.e., minimum impact studies, user satisfaction issues, and various types of wilderness experiences). In one particular article, Leo writes about applying "two contrasting principles of human workmanship, the principles of design and eolithism, to the issue of responsible environmental stewardship" (Dustin and McAvoy, 1984, p. 161). This article suggests that there are differing perspectives that can be taken toward issues of how humans should be conceptualizing themselves in relation to the environment. Such writing is a departure from the standard fare of land management commonly seen in outdoor recreation journals. Leo, by engaging in such discussions, is offering alternatives and suggesting that how we view the environment is up for negotiation at some level. Seen from the perspective of much of the writing in outdoor recreation, publications of this nature are more radical, because they move people to consider how they construct themselves in relation to the environment and begins the process of decentring the dominant notions of many North American views toward wilderness space and its use. As well as developing an eolithic ethic, Leo has also written on Native American land ethics (Jostad, McAvoy and McDonald, 1996; and McDonald and McAvoy, 1996), which opens up space for discussion of various cultural elements in environmental ethics. Leo, as a prominent member of outdoor recreation, plays a role in shaping the discourse of the field. These writings help to bring a diversity of viewpoints and voices that otherwise might remain

mainly silent.

Another discursive force that Leo is subject to is the American system of wilderness designation. Unlike Bob, who works and writes mainly from a Canadian, camping, and outdoor education perspective, Leo is embedded in an American discourse on what wilderness is. In 1964 the Wilderness Act was passed in the United States of America, which set out the definition of what could count as wilderness areas, and hence, what could and should be protected under such a definition. Leo designs his trip to focus on some of these issues of land designation, because he feels it to be an important issue in contemporary land management in the United States of America The trip and the course on outdoor education that Leo teaches both have a focus on the history and development of the wilderness system of protected areas in the United States of America The trip that Leo leads follows a river system and traverses some of the distinctions in land classifications. He concludes the trip by inviting the group to reflect on their experiences along the river and to begin to understand the effects and efforts it took to have the later section of the river designated as a protected area. In the course, Leo outlines some of the developments in recent American political history that have contributed to certain attitudes in the government toward land use and designation and the effects of this on outdoor education models. In contrast, Bob's trip moves through Crown land: an area designated as such by the government, but often not developed as "wilderness." There are less restrictions on the types of development that can occur in it, yet it remains relatively undeveloped (in part because the developmental potential of the Canadian Shield is low). Bob sees less need to engage in discussion of the impacts of wilderness designation

because the issue is not as pressing in the area he moves through on his trip. The land that Bob travels through is not wilderness in the same sense that the land Leo uses for his trip is; the Canadian government does not designate land as "wilderness" in the same way or with the same force as the American government does, and Bob's discourse reflects this. Leo's emphasis on wilderness ecosystems as well as his writings on frontier values, no rescue wilderness areas, and the benefits that wilderness can provide for people arises in an historical context of American efforts to preserve land defined in a certain way.

Leo's writing on the frontier metaphor (McAvoy and Dustin, 1989) for wilderness is an example of how the American vision of what counts as wilderness has influenced his perception of landscapes. Bob engages in different discourses, because, in Canada, the emphasis on opening the West and exploring and populating the wilderness takes a different spin. It was factors such as the fur trade and the drive to unify the country by railroad as an assurance against the perceived threat of the United States of America that lead to much of the exploration and population of Canada. Situating Bob in Canadian historical settings adds another level of understanding to why, in his discourse, land use and designation take a backseat to issues such as images of Voyageurs, historical readings of Canadian explorers, and figures such as Grey Owl, which fit with a particular construction of how Canadian landscapes were explored and the motivations for travel through such landscapes.

Seeing Bob's and Leo's discourses as embedded within the larger field of historical exploration and the system of government designation helps us understand some of the forces they have to contend with. Bob or Leo cannot simply ignore these historical

forces because not only are they a product of that system, but so to are the students each teach, the journals they submit to, and the other members of the parks and recreation profession. Writing on outdoor recreation that does not deal with or address how wilderness or the environment has been historically and politically defined and constructed would have a hard time gaining currency. For example, Leo may challenge various definitions of how people can and should relate to the environment, yet he still couches the environment in terms of wilderness areas, because he is a product of that system, and it is through the mobilization of such a definition that Leo's discourse more easily gains acceptance and credibility.

Seeing Bob's and Leo's discourses as historically situated is not a deterministic claim that denies any agency to either of them. They can challenge the dominant views, suggest alternatives, and help shape the field in the future; yet even as they do, they must contend with forces that are larger than the individual. No matter what they do, they cannot alter the processes that gave rise to the system of discourses in the United States of America or Canada. In many ways, both must work within their respective systems even if, and when, they wish to challenge it.

In the course that Leo teaches on outdoor education, he outlines some of the historical processes that have occurred in the United States of America toward environmental education. He emphasizes to the students that in the 1980's there was pressure from the government to alter the goals of environmental education. The feeling in Congress was that environmental education produced

> flaming environmentalists who feel that no economic development

should happen because of the damage to the environment. And so there's been some major political pressure placed on environmental education to change that model so that its not responsible environmental behaviour that's the outcome, its critical thinking skills is the outcome.

The result of this historical development is that Leo now presents students with models that encourage responsible decision making as the outcome. His course on outdoor education models and perspectives traces historical developments that saw the first models of outdoor education as an attempt to protect wilderness areas against development,

> but then the industry folks got a look at it, and the department of natural resources forestry folks got a look at the model for how environmental education should be implemented in schools and boy scouts and camps... And now you're seeing a lot more infusion of considering the resource...the benefits of natural resources like timber, and so its not just environmental, meaning nature, but its also environmental, meaning the built environment and farms...Because again there's a political backlash against environmental education going on in this country...many people are feeling that the environmental educators were turning kids into environmentalists who were going to be going to city council meetings and other meetings carrying signs saying "don't built the factory outside of town because

its gonna harm the marsh."

Leo's discourse promotes an understanding of wilderness use as a movement from pro-wilderness to a consideration of the economic value of such land, and, hence, Leo must negotiate through this issue. Bob does not engage in any such discussion, nor does he indicate that it is an issue in need of attention. The historical processes in Canada are distinct from those in the United States of America to some degree, and both Bob and Leo are affected by the history of each country.

Leo sees a danger in offering a course such as the one he does that is pro-wilderness. He says that some university professors have been forced to drop any course that has the word "wilderness" in its title because of pressure from other departments like forestry and economics. He says that he is lucky that he can still offer a course that is one hundred percent pro-wilderness, but this is the exception. In this light, Leo has constructed himself as engendering a discourse that is resistive of some of the recent developments toward what can count as acceptable environmental education. It is not an easy line to walk for Leo, and he is concerned about the direction of future developments. In part, this concern might be motivating him to structure his courses and undertake the writing he does as a way of countering some of the developments he is not entirely comfortable with.

Chapter Six:
Conclusion

Introduction

This thesis is an examination of the effects of power as manifested in and through the discourse on environmental ethics of two outdoor leaders/scholars. The two participants in this study (Bob Henderson and Leo McAvoy) were selected, because they are prominent members of the outdoor education and recreation field and have made significant contributions to the formation of the discursive field of outdoor education and recreation. In addition, they both have long histories in this field and clearly reflect some of its main currents, texts, complexities, and depths. The focus of my analysis has been on the discursive fields of outdoor education and recreation as reflected through Bob and Leo; it should not be seen as an analysis or critique of either Bob or Leo as individuals.

The position I have taken to view the discursive field of outdoor education and recreation is, first off, a recognition that any negative or positive results of power are discursively positioned as such by the viewer; they are not absolute. Second, I assume that decentring notions of the stable, masterful subject or of discourses that are premised on a one to one connection to Reality can lead to a playful freedom of choice that is denied or curtailed when discourses are not seen as arbitrary human constructs with no necessary, given, or inherent connection to Reality. This freedom and the corresponding ability to create and re-create both our future and ourselves through our discourse I take as good. That this freedom and creative ability is good forms a grounding assumption that leads to my attempts at decentring discourses in outdoor education and recreation that deny or

mask their arbitrary and constructed nature.

It was in Bob's discourse that the attempt to unmask the agency of the human subject in creating and constructing itself and the world can been more clearly seen. The discursive field of deep ecology that Bob aligns himself with constructs the human self as already in a relationship with the earth and seeks to uncover or surface that relationship. Through cultural disorientation, Bob hopes to challenge the students to move beyond what he perceives as their entry points toward a recognition and a celebration of their connection with the earth. This is a discourse that works to deny the agency of human authorship. The earth is constructed as active agent in the surfacing of the relationship, while Bob is cast in a minor supporting role. One of the effects of so doing is to reduce the ability of the human author to embrace the constructed and political nature of discourse. The discourse on deep ecology that Bob employs works to deny his agency, which, in turn, constructs him out of the power to alter or engage in the ways he constructs and negotiates the lines around what humans are and what nature is.

There are also resistive elements in Bob's discourse. He engenders a particular view of the world that is, in some ways, at odds with the view of many others in the outdoor education perspective. Due to Bob's emphasis on emancipatory euphoria, he has a difficult time negotiating in an academic world that constructs knowledge to be something that can be passed along to students and then replicated on tests. Bob's view of the relationship the students have with the earth is also resistive at some levels. Bob feels that most of the students on his trips are enculturated into Western society to such a degree that they cannot easily see how they are connected to the earth. His discourse on

surfacing this connection is framed (by Bob) to be disorienting for the student. Bob feels that the students on his trips will be challenged in ways they might find unsettling. Bob positions his view as challenging to the more dominant view(s) of society as reflected in the students. In this way, Bob engenders resistive sites where he hopes to create both alternative forms of knowledge and experiences.

Leo's discourse connects more with some elements in the land ethic discursive field. Leo's discourse brings to the fore notions that the wilderness is a special and valuable place that consists mainly of biotic communities. It is these biotic communities, which exemplify traits of stability, integrity, and beauty, that are valuable. For Leo, wilderness is a place of vast vistas that can provide benefits for people not easily gained in urban settings. In this notion of what wilderness is can be seen some of the resistive elements in Leo's discourse. Leo positions his view as less dominant than the view the wilderness is valuable for economic resources. Leo attempts, in his course on wilderness and on his trip, to introduce the students to this alternative notion that the wilderness is valuable, because it offers opportunities to experience awe, beauty, and majesty; it offers a challenge; and it provides a metaphor for a journey–both physical and meta-physical.

Leo's construction of wilderness as a place where the beauty, stability, and integrity of biotic communities can be encountered leads him to support various minimum impact practices. Efforts such as reducing the damage caused by excessive trampling are seen as good, because they protect the wilderness as Leo defines it. Leo places more emphasis on minimum impact than Bob does, in part because of his definition of wilderness as comprised of biotic communities. Both Bob's and Leo's discourse

constructs various definitions of what the environment is and, hence, what counts as good and proper behaviour in it. Through these definitions and constructions, both Bob and Leo position the human subject in relation to the world and this positioning has effects.

Who We Are and Who We Are Not

One of the main effects of the discursive field of outdoor education and recreation, as represented/created by the two participants, is to create particular meanings for what is human, what counts as non-human, and how the two should interact. The environmental ethics that the field produces most often construct nature or wilderness as a positive place where humans can receive certain benefits such as learning more about themselves or coming to an understanding of humanity's place in the universe–an understanding closely connected, for one of the participants, to notions of Christian spirituality. In addition, the discursive field of outdoor education and recreation's positioning of nature or wilderness often constructs it as a place separate from human constructed environments such as cities and urban spaces.

Positioning nature or wilderness as distinct from urban space and as a place where insights into the human self can be gained leads to the privileging of certain behaviours. The non-human world that is constructed by ethics, such as the land ethic and deep ecology, becomes positive and contains certain benefits in proportion to the lack of human interference within it. Hence, humans must be careful of their impact when out in wilderness so as not to negatively impact it. When backcountry users, like Leo or Bob, venture out into wilderness, they expect certain things. Their discourse suggests that they

both expect an absence of excessive[13] impacts in wilderness areas. Because of such a construction of wilderness, minimum impact practices become a set of behaviours that are privileged in the environmental ethics discourse of Bob and Leo. The discourse of minimum impact practices that arises out of a construction of nature or wilderness as non-urban and positive becomes a powerful self-regulating panoptic administration that inscribes compliance onto the human subject. We begin to see ourselves as damaging to an environment that we value, therefore, we discipline ourselves to reduce our impacts.

Within the discourse of Bob and Leo technology occupies a dangerous position. When non-urban environments are seen as places without human influence, technology can be seen as damaging to wilderness. Leo's emphasis on no rescue wilderness areas and Bob's distinction between things and devices are two examples of the field's ambiguous relationship with technology. Ambiguous because, on the one hand, outdoor education and recreation discourse often advocates nostalgic renderings of wilderness use (i.e., a return to simpler days when technology was not so dangerous), yet the technology involved in accessing many wilderness areas is enormous (i.e., long drives or flights to the area and high-tech equipment). Ironically, accessing these areas often results in high impact as well, which makes an interesting conflict with the minimum impact practices.

Issues surrounding technology and minimum impact can create a division of the world into two types of places–those areas (usually defined as "urban") that impact is acceptable, and those areas (usually defined as "wilderness") that impacts need to be

---

[13] "Excessive" being a somewhat subjective notion that is dependent upon how one defines not only wilderness but also on the value one places upon that wilderness.

reduced. Using a stove, for example, is often promoted as appropriate in wilderness areas, because it does not impact that area; yet a stove does have impact in terms of fossil fuels and the materials used in its construction, but this impact occurs in areas in which impacts are deemed acceptable (i.e., outside wilderness areas).

How issues of impact and technology are negotiated, and what is promoted as "better" or privileged, is an area that deserves more attention. Who benefits from the discursive constructions of who humans are, what their place in the world is, and what kind of world humans inhabit all have political implications and consequences. This is one area that this thesis begins to explore, but to understand the complexity of the issues will require more research and study. For example, it would be useful to interview more outdoor leaders and explore more of the discourse created by the field of outdoor education and recreation in relation to the negotiation of the line between acceptable impacts, what it might mean to engage technology in a playful manner, and how outdoor leaders might begin to appropriate technology in a productive manner.

Future Research Directions

The possibility for the playful engagement of technology has been taken up by Haraway's (1991) image of the cyborg. The three boundaries that Haraway suggests are transgressed by the cyborg open up other possibilities for discursively creating the world we live in. Haraway suggests that the distinctions between what is human and what is machine, what is nature and what is non-nature, and what is physical and what is non-physical all begin to blur when examined closely. She suggests that a stable human self as

distinct from technology does not exist for a cyborg, and rather than being a despairing death of a distinct human subject, suggests a proliferation of possibly identities of human subjects waiting to be created and explored. Human subjects are inscribed by history, politics, gender (among others), and are self-created or discursively-created inscriptions of power that can generate new subjectivities. Confronting the discursive nature of the world and our role in it, forces us to confront the ecological problematic in new ways. The ecological crisis, however defined, becomes more complex, open, conflicting, and ambiguous. Decentring masterful narratives is to resist the pull of simplicity and engage in confirming acts of self-creation. A recognition of the boundary transgressions suggested by the cyborg image is not to forego knowledge, but to locate and situate it. It is not that the boundaries between nature, humans, culture, and technology do not exists, but that they are produced. As Conley (1997) says, "nature is not there as a handmaiden for humans, but humans none the less organize it through their social organization; through everyday life, that is, primarily through a function of the agency offered by language [and discourse]" (p. 43). This productive notion shifts attention from dualistic renderings of the world to the process of how dualisms are produced, positioned, and negotiated.

> In other words, if we ourselves are the products of both technology and culture, or more potently, compounds of the organic, technical, mythical, textual, and political, what novel modes of action can this facilitate? [If all is discursively created] it affords one the observation that the contemporary condition is not about the denaturalization of 'nature', as deep ecology [and the land ethic] would have it, but rather

about the particular kind of production *of* nature that has taken place (van Wyck, 1997, p. 119).

Human agency plays a more central role in this decentred configuration of the world. Humans are now seen as being active creators (or co-creators) of the boundaries and as organizing the distinctions between the world and ourselves. These boundaries are necessary, but arbitrary, and we have the ability to re-configure them in myriad ways. Stories and images, like the cyborg, that exist in the destabilized zone between ontologically grounded dualisms have the potential to seize the tools for re-crafting ourselves and recoding our bodies into new identities that lack closure or completeness. We must survive, but we must survive with the recognition that we are partial, incomplete, and without closure. It is to resist the pull not only of simplicity, but also of the mythic reunion of the Garden from which we supposedly fell. It means "embracing the skillful task of reconstructing the boundaries of daily life in partial connection with others, in communication with all our parts" (Haraway, 1991, p.181). The future is unknown, open for negotiation, and discursive. Outdoor leaders and scholars can embrace this decentred future, engage it playfully to explore our role as humans in creating a world we wish to live in, and in the process create ourselves in relation to that world.

Re-creating ourselves and our future is not a simple task. Our embeddedness and position in the world is a powerful inscription upon our bodies and subjectivities. How we define ourselves is not just a matter of personal choice. The image of the cyborg suggests that it is a construction, but this does not reduce the power of that construction. We are who we believe we are because of powerful and complex processes that work beyond a

single person's agency. Changing and resisting these views of ourselves, the environment, and how we should relate to that environment is difficult process.

This thesis has engaged, in a particular way, the question of how power works to position human subjectivities and the natural environment. There are other ways to engage this question of the ecological problematic. Some future directions to pursue this issue include an examination of other perspectives from which to illustrate the effects of power. For example, the history of parks in Canada and the United States of America are different, and this thesis only partially engages how these differences work to exert influence on both participants. As well, both participants are male, North-American academics, so the breadth of perspectives they engender are limited by their demographics. Including other cultural perspectives, gender differences, or issues surrounding integrated wilderness use, for example, have the potential to broaden understanding of the ways environmental ethics are constructed and performed, and the discursive effects of those constructions.

Lastly, this thesis opens the door to the potentially empowering possibility of re-creating ourselves in new subjectivities, but what those subjectivities might be and the effects that would have on how outdoor professionals lead trips, write, and create knowledge is beyond the scope of this thesis. It would prove to be an interesting and engaging enterprise to follow this research with an exploration of what the consequences are of living and working as an outdoor professional in a world that is recognized as more discursive.

Reference List

Asimov, I., & Pohl F. (1991). Our Angry Earth. New York: Tom Doherty Associates.

Attarian, M., R. (1997). Practical approaches for teaching Leave No Trace. In S. Guthrie, J. Macke, & R. Watters (Eds.), Back to the Basics: Proceedings of the International Conference on Outdoor Recreation and Education, November 7-9, 1996. Salt Lake City, Utah.

Beringer, A. (1997). Meditation on daffodils: Toward a soulful outdoor education. Paper presented at the Environmental Justice: Global Ethics for the 21st Century conference, Melbourne, Australia.

Bickerton, H., & Henderson, R. (In Press). How is it possible to justify a 'value-laden' position for ecologically-based adventure education? In T. Potter & S. Wurdington (Eds.), Controversial Issues in Adventure Education.

Bonney, B. F., & Drury, J. K. (1992). The Backcountry Classroom: Lesson Plans for Teaching in the Wilderness. Saranac, NY: Wilderness Education Association.

Bratton, S. P. (1988). The original desert solitaire: Early Christian monasticism and wilderness. Environmental Ethics, 10 (1), 31-54.

Bratton, S. P. (1992). Loving nature: Eros or agape? Environmental Ethics, 14 (1), 2-25.

Callicott, J. B. (1989). In Defense Of The Land Ethic. Albany, New York: State University of New York Press.

Caudell, L., S. (1996). Life studies: Learning beyond the chain-link fence.

Northwest Education, 1 (2), 10-12, 14-15.

Clegg, S. R. (1989). Frameworks of Power. London: Sage Publications.

Cockrell, D. (Ed.) (1991). The Wilderness Educator: The Wilderness Education Association Curriculum Guide. Saranac, NY: Wilderness Education Association.

Cohen, M. (1995). Outdoor attractions. Taproot, 9 (2), 10-11.

Cornell, J. (1979). Sharing Nature With Children. Ananda Publications.

Cornell, J. (1989). Sharing the Joy of Nature: nature activities for all ages. Nevada city, CA: Dawn Publications.

Cole, D., N. (1995a). Disturbance of natural vegetation by camping: Experimental applications of low level stress. Environmental Management [on-line], 19 (3), 405-416. Available HTTP: http//:www.wildernessnet/library/pubs/266.pdf

Cole, D., N. (1995b). Recreational trampling experiements: Effects of trampler weight and shoe type [on-line]. Available HTTP: http//:www.wildernessnet/library/pubs/258.pdf

Cole, D., N. (1996). Wilderness recreation in the United States–trends in use, users, and impacts. International Journal of Wilderness [on-line], 2 (3), 14-18. Available HTTP: http//:www.wildernessnet/library/pubs/293.pdf

Cole, D. N., Hammond, T. P., & McCool, S., F. (1997). Information quantity and communication effectiveness: Low-impact messages on wilderness trailside bulletin boards. Leisure Sciences, 19, (1), 59-72.

Cilimburg, A., & Monz, C. (1997). Wildland recreation and human waste: A review of problems, practices and concerns. Avaliable HTTP:

http://research.nols.edu/cilimburg_etal.1997.html

Conley, V. A. (1997). Ecopolitics: The Environment in Poststructuralist Thought. London: Routledge.

Csikszentmihalyi, M., & Kleiber, D., A. (1991). Leisure and self-actualization. In B. L. Driver, P. J. Brown, & G. L. Peterson (Eds.), Benefits of Leisure. State College, Pennsylvania: Venture Publishing.

Curtin, D. (1994). Dogen, deep ecology, and the ecological self. Environmental Ethics, 16 (2), 195-213.

Denzin, N. K. (1989). Interpretive Interactionism. In L. Bickman (Series Ed.), Applied Social Research Methods Series: Vol.16. Newbury Park, California: Sage Publications Inc.

Devall, B. (1988). Simple In Means, Rich In Ends: Practicing Deep Ecology. Layton, UT: Gibbs Smith.

Devall, B., & Sessions, G. (1985). Deep Ecology: Living As If Nature Mattered. Layton, UT: Gibbs M. Smith, Inc.

Dower, N. (1989). What is environmental ethics? In N. Dower (Ed.), Ethics and Environmental Responsibility (pp. 1-10). Aldershot, England: Gower Publishing Company Limited.

Dreyfus, H. L., & Rabinow, P. (1982). Michel Foucault: Beyond Structuralism and Hermenutics. Brighton: Harvester

Drury, J., & Massari, K. (1994). Wilderness leadership training programs: A help or hindrance to resource managers? Trends, 31 (3), 15-18.

Dustin, D. L., Knopf, R., & Fox, K. (1993). Building multicultural responsiveness into outdoor recreation management. In A. W. Ewert, D. J. Chavez, & A. W. Magill (Eds.), Culture, conflict, and communication in the wildland-urban interface (pp.259-265). Boulder, CA: Westview Press.

Dustin, D., L., & McAvoy, L. (1981). The right to risk in wilderness. Journal of Forestry, 79 (3), 150-152.

Dustin, D., L., & McAvoy, L. (1984). Toward environmental eolithism. Environmental Ethics, 6, 161-166.

Dustin, D. L., & McAvoy, L. (1987). Outdoor recreation and the environment: Problems and prospects. The Environmental Professional, 9, 343-346.

Dustin, D. L., McAvoy L., & Rankin, J. S. (1991). Land ethics in a culturally diverse society. Trends, 28 (3), 25-27

Dustin, D. L., McAvoy L., & Schultz, J. H. (1991). Recreation rightly understood. In T. L. Goodale & P. A. Witt (Eds.), Recreation and Leisure: Issues in an Era of Change (3rd ed.) (pp.97-106). State College, PA: Venture Publishing.

Dustin, D. L., McAvoy, L. H., & Schultz, J. H. (1995). Stewards Of Access/Custodians Of Choice: A Philosophical Foundation For The Park And Recreation Profession (2nd ed.). Champaign, Illinois: Sagamore Publishing.

Ewert, A. (1993). Research in land ethics: the problem of ethnicity, culture, and methods. In A. W. Ewert, D. J. Chavez, & A. W. Magill (Eds.), Culture, conflict, and communication in the wildland-urban interface (pp.299-312). Boulder, CA: Westview Press.

Ewert, A. (1996). Research in outdoor education: Our place on the porch. In L. H. McAvoy, L. A. Stringer, M. D. Bialeschki, & A. B. Young (Eds.), Coalition for Education in the Outdoors: Third Research Symposium Proceedings (pp. 7-8). New York: Coalition for Education in the Outdoors.

Ewert, A., & Priest, S. (1990). Leisure in the natural environment–Past, prologue and

promise. Journal of Physical Education, Recreation and dance, 61 (4), 33-64.

Foucault, M. (1977). Discipline and Punish: The birth of the prison. New York: Pantheon.

Fox, K. M., & McAvoy, L. H. (1995). Ethical practices in the filed of outdoor leadership. In L. S. Frank (Ed.), Association For Experiential Education International Conference Proceedings, 23, 70-72.

Fox, K. M., & Reed, M. (1994). Learning about ethical outdoor leadership. In L. McAvoy, L. A. Stringer, & A. Ewert (Eds.), Coalition For Education In The outdoors: Second Research Symposium Proceedings (pp. 53-65). New York: Coalition for Education in the Outdoors.

Gillroy, J. M. (1992). Public policy and environmental risk: Political theory, Human agency, and the imprisoned rider. Environmental Ethics, 14 (3), 217-237.

Haggard, L., M., & Williams, D., R. (1991). Self-identity benefits of leisure activities. In B. L. Driver, P. J. Brown, & G. L. Peterson (Eds.), Benefits of Leisure. State College, Pennsylvania: Venture Publishing.

Hall, D. (1998). Innovative methods to improve wildlife law compliance. In H.

Kirchner (Ed.), National Outdoor Ethics Conference Proceedings (pp. 57-62). Gaitherburg, MD: Izaak Walton League of America.

Hammitt, J., P., Freimund, W., Watson, A., Brod, R., & Monz, C. (1994). Effects of NOLS' Wind River wilderness course on responsible environmental behavior of students. Available HTTP: http://research.nols.edu/hammitt_etal.1994.html

Hanson, L. (1996). Reconstituting the boundaries of nature: The discursive formation of nature in the debate over the management of Banff National Park. Avante, 2 (2), 1-16.

Hardin, G. (1968). The tragedy of the commons. Science, 162, 1243-1248.

Haraway, D., J. (1991). Simians, Cyborgs, and Woman: The Reinvention of Nature. London: Free Association Books.

Henderson, R. (1993). The travels and final struggle of Herman J. Koehler. Nastawgan, Autumn, 11-15.

Henderson, R. (1994). How deep ecology and critical social theory come together in outdoor travel guiding: on the discovery of being a researcher. In L. McAvoy, L. A. Stringer, & A. Ewert (Eds.), Coalition For Education In The outdoors: Second Research Symposium Proceedings (pp. 90-91). New York: Coalition for Education in the Outdoors.

Henderson, R. (1996). Thoughts on the idea of adventure. The Trumpeter: Journal of Ecosophy, 13 (2), 85-86.

Henderson, R. (1997a). Friluftsliv. The Trumpeter: Journal of Ecosophy, 14 (2), 93-94.

Henderson, R. (1997b). Use of Games. Pathways: The Ontario Journal of Outdoor

Education, December, 16-22.

Henderson, R. (1998). Wild Words. Pathways: The Ontario Journal of Outdoor Education, 9 (6), 17-19.

Henderson, R. (In Press). The place of deep ecology and ecopsychology in adventure education. In J. C.Miles & S. Priest (Eds.), Adventure Education.

Henley, T. (1989). Rediscovery: Ancient Pathways–New Direction: A Guidebook to Outdoor Education. Vancouver, B. C.: Western Canada Wilderness Committee.

Hey, V. (1998, April). 'Space Girls': mental re/creations and representations of the 'other' in an ethnography of girls' school friendship. Paper presented at the symposium: Creating Others: debating methods, findings and contexts in studying young people today–an international dialogue AERA Annual meeting, San Diego.

Hooker, C. A. (1992). Responsibility, ethics and nature. In D. E. Cooper & J. A. Palmer (Eds.), The Environment In Question: Ethics And Global Issues (pp. 147-164). London: Routledge.

Horwood, B. (1991a). Stewardship as an environmental ethic. Pathways: The Ontario Journal of Outdoor Education, 3 (4), 5-10.

Horwood, B. (1991b). Tasting the berries: Deep ecology and experiential education. Journal Of Experiential Education, 14 (3), 23-26.

Horwood, B. (1996). Outdoor education and the schools. In L. H. McAvoy, L. A. Stringer, M. D. Bialeschki, & A. B. Young (Eds.), Coalition for Education in the Outdoors: Third Research Symposium Proceedings (pp.9-13). New York: Coalition for Education in the Outdoors.

Horwood, B., & Henderson, B. (1995). How and why leaves fall: A story sketch. Pathways: The Ontario Journal of Outdoor Education, 7 (5), 22-23.

Hutcheon, L. (1989). The Politics of the Postmodern. London: Routledge Press.

Hunt, J. S., Jr. (1990). Ethical Issues in Experiential Education. Boulder, CO: The Association for Experiential Education.

Hunt, J. S., Jr. (1995). Ethics and experiential education as professional practice. In K. Warren, M. Sakofs, & J. S. Hunt, Jr. (Eds.), The Theory Of Experiential Education (pp. 331-338). Dubuque, Iowa: Kendall/Hunt Publishing Company.

Johnson, E. (1984). Treating the dirt: Environmental ethics and moral theory. In T. Regan (Ed.), Earthbound: New Introductory Essays In Environmental Ethics (pp.336-363). Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Jorgensen, D. L. (1989). Participant Observation: A methodology for human studies. In L. Bickman (Series Ed.), Applied Social Research Methods Series: Vol. 15. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications Inc.

Jostad, P. M., McAvoy, L., & McDonald, D. (1996). Native American land ethics: Implications for natural resource management. Society and Natural Resources, 9, 565-581.

Kaza, S. (1996). Comparative perspectives of world religions: Views of nature and implications for land management. In B. L. Driver, D. Dustin, T. Baltic, G. Elsner, & G. Peterson (Eds.), Nature And The Human Spirit: Toward An Expanded Land Management Ethic (pp. 41-60). State College, PA: Venture Publishing.

Knapp, C. E. (1992). Lasting Lessons: A teacher's guide to reflecting on

experience. Charleston, WV: Appalachia Educational Laboratory Inc.

Knapp, C. E. (1996). Just Beyond the Classroom: Community Adventures for Interdisciplinary Learning. Charleston, WV: Appalachia Educational Laboratory Inc.

Kraft, R. J. (1992). Closed classrooms, high mountains and strange lands: An inquiry into culture and caring. The Journal of Experiential Learning 15 (3), 8-15.

Krapfel, P. (1989). Shifting: Nature's Way of Change. Cottonwood, CA: Paul Krapfel.

Kroll, M. (1995). Mud, muck, and other wonderful things: An environmental curriculum for five to eight year olds. Environmental Stewardship. National 4-H Council. (ERIC Document reproduction Service No. ED 417 928)

Kvale, S. (1996). InterViews: An Introduction to Qualitative Research Interviewing. London: Sage Publishing.

LaChapelle, D. (1991). Educating for deep ecology. Journal Of Experiential Education 14 (3), 18-22.

Laclau, E. (1980). Populist rupture and discourse. Screen Education, 34, 87-93.

Lehmann, K. (1991). Connecting ethics and group leadership: A case study. Journal Of Experiential Education 14 (3), 45-51.

Leopold, A.. (1949/1989). A Sand County Almanac: And Sketches Here And There. New York: Oxford University Press.

Matthews, B. (1993). Making the grade: Methods for teaching outdoor ethics. Iwla Outdoor Ethics Newsletter, Fall, 4-5.

Matthews, B. (1994). Fishing for environmental education. Camping Magazine, 66

(6), 16-19.

Matthews, B. E., & Riley, C. K. (1995). Teaching and Evaluating Environmental Ethic Programs. Vienna, VA: National Wildlife Federation.

Mathews, F. (1988). Conservation and self-realization: A deep ecology perspective. Environmental Ethics, 10 (4), 347-356.

McAvoy, L. (1987). Wilderness and justice for all. In L. H. McAvoy & D. Dustin (Eds.), Justice In Outdoor Recreation Resource Allocation: Vol. 3, No. 1 (pp. 37-44). San Diego, California: Institute for Leisure Behavior, San Diego State University.

McAvoy, L. (1990a). An environmental ethic for parks and recreation. Parks and Recreation, 25 (9), 68-72.

McAvoy, L. (1990b). Rescue-free wilderness areas. In J. C. Miles & S. Priest (Eds.), Adventure Education (pp. 335-343). State College, PA: Venture.

McAvoy, L., & Dustin, D. (1989). Resurrecting the frontier. Trends, 26 (3), 40-42.

McDaniel, J. B. (1990). Earth, Sky, Gods & Mortals: Developing An Ecological Spirituality. Mystic, CT: Twenty-Third Publications.

McDonald, D., & McAvoy, L. (1996). In countless ways for thousands of years: Native American relationships to wildlands and other protected places. Trends, 33 (4), 35-39.

McDonald, B., L., & Schreyer, R. (1991). Spiritual benefits of leisure participation and leisure settings. In B. L. Driver, P. J. Brown, & G. L. Peterson (Eds.), Benefits of Leisure. State College, Pennsylvania: Venture Publishing.

McLean, D. (1997). Response to Coalter: Understanding the 'meaningfulness' of leisure. Leisure Sciences, 19 (4), 273-275.

McRae, K. (1986). Developing an environmental ethic in outdoor programs. Journal of Experiential Education, 1 (2), 2-7.

McRae, K. (1985). An environmental education for outdoor education: Dilemma and resolution. Australian Journal of Environmental Education, 1 (2), 2-7.

Mitten, D. (1995). The value of feminist ethics in experiential education teaching and leadership. In L. S. Frank (Ed.), Association For Experiential Education International Conference Proceedings, 23, 175-181.

Monz, C., A., Cole, D., N., Johnson, L., A., & Spildie, D., R. (1994). Response of five native plant species to trampling in the Wind River Range, Wyoming, U.S.A. Available HTTP: http://research.nols.edu/monz_etal.1994.html

Monz, C., A., Meier, G., A., Cole, D., N., & Welker, J., M. (1994). Response of moist and dry arctic tundra to trampling and warmer temperatures. Available HTTP: http://research.nols.edu/monz_etal.1994b.html

Naess, A. (1990). Man apart and deep ecology: A reply to Reed. Environmental Ethics, 12 (2), 185-192.

Orlie, M. A. (1997). Living Ethically Acting Politically. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Parker, J. (1993). Environmental ethics: Questions for adult learning. Adult Learning, 4 (8), 216-217.

Priest, S. (1987). Preparing Effective Outdoor Leaders. Eugene, OR: University of

Oregon Press.

Priest, S. (1993). To act or not to act: The environmental learning ladder. Pathways to Outdoor Communication, 3 (2), 8-11.

Priest, S., & Baillie, R. (1995). Justifying the risk to others: The real razor's edge. In K. Warren, M. Sakofs, & J. S. Hunt, Jr. (Eds.), The Theory Of Experiential Education (pp. 307-316). Dubuque, Iowa: Kendall/Hunt Publishing Company.

Priest, S, & Gass. M.,A. (1997). Effective Leadership in Adventure Programming. University of New Hampshire: Human Kinetics

Prochaska, V. (1994). About ecology, deep ecology and the meaning of life: A talk to teens. The Trumpeter: Journal of Ecosophy, 11 (2), 80-82.

Quinn, W. J. (1992/93). Native American hunting tradition as a basis for outdoor education. Journal of Outdoor Education, 26, 12-18.

Quinn, M. S., & Scott, J. R. (1997). Of mega-malls and soft-shelled turtles: Deep ecological education to counter homogeneity. The Trumpeter: Journal of Ecosophy, 14 (2), 61-65.

Regan, T. (1984). Introduction. In T. Regan (Ed.), Earthbound: New Introductory Essays In Environmental Ethics (pp.3-37). Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Regan, T. (1986). The case for animal rights. In D. VanDeVeer & C. Pierce (Eds.), People, Penguins, And Plastic Trees: Basic Issues In Environmental Ethics (pp. 32-39). Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Company.

Reitan, E. H. (1996). Deep ecology and the irrelevance of morality. Environmental Ethics, 18 (4), 411-424.

Ridd, C. (1994). Imagining the world, doing justice. In M.A. Beavis (Ed.) Environmental Stewardship: History, Theory and Practice: Workshop Proceedings. (March 11-12, 1994). Winnipeg, MB: Institute of Urban Studies.

Rolston III, H. (1988). Environmental Ethics: Duties To And Values In The Natural World. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Rolston III, H. (1992). Challenges in environmental ethics. In D. E. Cooper & J. A. Palmer (Eds.), The Environment In Question: Ethics And Global Issues (pp. 135-146). London: Routledge.

Rothe, J. P. (1993). Qualitative Research: A Practical Guide. Heidelberg, Ontario: RCI/PDE Publications.

Schatz, C., McAvoy, L., & Parker, T. (1993). Bringing environmental education down to earth. Camping Magazine, March/April.

Schlein, S., J., McAvoy, L., Lais, G., L., & Rynders, J., E.(1993). Integrated Outdoor Education and Adventure Programs. Champaign, IL: Sagamore.

Schwandt, T. A. (1994). Constructivist, interpretivist approaches to human inquiry. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), Handbook Of Qualitative Research (pp. 118-137). Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.

Schwandt, T. A. (1997). Qualitative Inquiry: A Dictionary of Terms. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Simpson, S. (1993). The intrinsic value of minimum impact. Journal of Experiential Education, 16 (2), 34-37.

Simpson, S. (1996). A Leopold for the nineties: The ecological age and outdoor

recreation. Journal Of Experiential Education, 19 (1), 14-21.

Singer, P. (1986). Animal Liberation. In D. VanDeVeer & C. Pierce (Eds.), People, Penguins, And Plastic Trees: Basic Issues In Environmental Ethics (pp. 24-31). Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Company.

Singer, P. (1997). Ethics across the species boundary. Paper presented at the Environmental Justice: Global Ethics for the 21st Century conference, Melbourne, Australia.

St. Pierre, E. A. (1997). Circling the text: Nomadic writing practices. Qualitative inquiry, 3 (4), 403-417.

Steele, R. S. (1989). A critical hermeneutics for psychology: Beyond positivism to an exploration of the textual unconscious. In M. J. Packer & R. B. Addison (Eds.), Entering The Circle: Hermeneutic Investigation In Psychology (pp. 223-238). Albany, New York: State University of New York Press.

Steffen, L. H. (1992). In defense of dominion. Environmental Ethics, 14 (1), 63-80.

Taylor, P. (1986). Respect For Nature: A Theory Of Environmental Ethics. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Tesch, R. (1990). Qualitative Research: Analysis Types And Software Tools. New York: The Falmer Press.

Teutsch, M., R. (1998). Wildlife counts. Science Teacher, 65 (2), 30-33.

Tribe, L., H. (1986). Ways not to think about plastic trees: New foundations for environmental law. In D. VanDeVeer & C. Pierce (Eds.), People, Penguins, and Plastic

Trees: Basic Issues in Environmental Ethics (pp. 253-262). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company.

van Matre, S. (1974). Acclimatization: A Personal and Reflective Approach to a Natural Relationship. Branford Woods, Indiana: American Camping Association.

van Matre, S. (1979). Sunship Earth: An Acclimatization Program for Outdoor Learning. Martinsville, Indiana: American Camping Association.

van Matre, S., & Johnson, B. (1987). Earthkeepers: Four Keys for Helping Young People Live in Harmony with the Earth. Warrenville, IL: The Institute for Earth Education.

van Wyck, P., C. (1997). Primitives in the Wilderness: Deep ecology and the missing human subject. New York: State University of New York Press.

VanDeVeer, D., & Pierce, C. (1986). People, Penguins, and Plastic Trees: Basic Issues in Environmental Ethics. CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company.

Warren, G., A. (1998). Recreation management in the Bob Marshal, Great Bear, and Scapegoat Wildernesses, 1987-1997. In S. F. McCool & D. N. Cole (Eds), Proceedings: Limits of Acceptable Change and Related Planning Processes: Progress and Future Directions, May 20-22, 1997. Available HTTP: www.wildernessnet/library/pubs/320d.pdf

Watson, A., E., & Niccolucci, M., J. (1995). Conflicting goals of wilderness management: Natural conditions vs natural experiences. In D. J. Chaves (Ed.), Proceedings of the Second Symposium on Social Aspects and Recreation Research: 1994, February 23-25 [on-line], San Diego, CA. Available HTTP:

www.wildernessnet/library/pubs/269.pdf

Wignall, C., & Henderson, B. (1994). Two parables about education. Pathways: The Ontario Journal of Outdoor Education, 6 (5), 9-11.

Williams, J., & Monz, C., A. (1994). Fragile rivers: Current knowledge regarding minimum impact use and identification of significant research gaps. [on-line] Available HTTP: http://research.nols.edu/williams_etal.1994.html

Williams, T. (1989). Why Johnny shoots stop signs. Pathways: Ontario Journal of Outdoor Education, 1 (2), 12-18.

Yaple, C. (1993). Reconnecting with nature: A vision for the future. Taproot, Fall Issue.

Zimmerman, M., E. (1994). Contesting the Earth's Future: Radical Ecology and Postmodernity. Los Angeles: University of California Press.